

NINTH.

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

BOARD OF MANAGERS

OF THE

MASS. ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

PRESENTED JANUARY 27, 1841.

WITH AN APPENDIX.

BOSTON:
DOW & JACKSON, PRINTERS,
14 Devonshire Street,
1841.

NINTH
ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
BOARD OF MANAGERS
OF THE
MASS. ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

PRESENTED JANUARY 27, 1841.
WITH AN APPENDIX.

BOSTON:
DOW & JACKSON, PRINTERS,
14 Devonshire Street,
1841.

R E P O R T.

THE expiration of another year of labor in the beneficent cause of emancipation makes it the constitutional duty of the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society to present their Ninth Annual Report. In doing so, they would reverently acknowledge the superintending care of the Almighty over the interests of the enterprise which it is their privilege to espouse, and which they cannot doubt must eventually obtain a splendid triumph over all opposition. While they sincerely distrust their ability to discharge, in the best possible manner, the weighty responsibilities which devolve upon them as the directors of THE PIONEER ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY in the U. States, they feel sustained by the consciousness that they have sincerely labored to promote the best interests of the Society, and, consequently, to hasten the day of jubilee when millions of our race, who are now pining in servitude, shall leap from their fetters, a redeemed and regenerated people. If, during the past year, the operations of the Society have in any measure been more limited than the exigencies of our cause would seem to demand, it has not been owing to any lack of effort or abatement of zeal on the part of the Board, but to causes over which they have had no control. From the position which they occupy before the public, as a Board of Managers, they would gladly retire—not that they have grown weary in sustaining the onerous burdens of that position, but to give place to others better qualified to fill it. From an earnest and hearty support of the enterprise itself, they know of no earthly object that could induce them to withdraw. Individually and collectively, they feel it to be among their religious obligations to plead the cause of their enslaved countrymen, at whatever sacrifice of reputation, worldly prosperity, or personal advan-

tage. As American citizens, deeply solicitous for the honor and welfare of their beloved country, they feel bound to be, and to avow themselves, uncompromising abolitionists. To be any thing else would, in their judgment, be to take the side of the oppressor against the oppressed, of cruelty against mercy, of iniquity against righteousness.

Since the formation of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, every year has been one of trial, of suffering, of persecution, of triumph, in its history. Composed of only twelve individuals at first, its growth has been vigorous in proportion to the amount of opposition raised against it. As the fruitful mother of more than two thousand kindred societies, it has peculiar claims to the respect and admiration of abolitionists universally. In consequence of having been foremost in the anti-slavery conflict, and at all times conspicuous for its fearless and uncompromising character, it has been assailed with more frequency and bitterness, by the enemies of the colored race, than any other association in the land. It has had to contend with foes within, as well as foes without: hostility to it has assumed almost every conceivable guise, from the most violent to the most insidious: but in no one year has such systematic efforts been made for its annihilation as during the last—made, too, by some who were formerly zealous in its behalf, and under the pretence of forwarding the anti-slavery enterprise. The most absurd, the most false and flagrant charges have been circulated against it in various part of the country, by professed abolitionists; and it would seem as if, in their estimation, slavery itself is a trifling evil in comparison with the existence of a society, which, by the blessing of God, has been so signally instrumental in rousing this whole nation from its moral stupor on the subject of slavery, and bringing so many of the inhabitants to repentance. This unnatural and criminal opposition has arisen from the spirit of sectarianism—that giant foe of God and man. The facts in the case are well known to all those who are conversant with the rise and progress of the unhappy divisions which have taken place in the anti-slavery ranks. It is not deemed necessary, therefore, to go into any minute details on this subject.

In the last Report of the Board, it was stated that a secession had been made from this Society, and that the seceders had organized themselves into an association, called the "Massachusetts Abolition Society." The position assumed by that Society is one of unmitigated hostility to ours. By its MANAGERS, its OFFICIAL ORGAN and AGENTS, it has left untried no device to prejudice the public mind, and especially the religious portion of the community, against the State Anti-Slavery Society, and ourselves as its official representatives. All this has been done with such a wanton disregard of truth, such a wide departure from the ground of anti-slavery union and fellowship, such palpable intent to gratify personal and sectarian feelings, that it is in the highest degree painful to contemplate such a developement of moral character.

In an address of the Executive Committee of the Massachusetts Abolition Society to the people of Massachusetts, they use the following language :

" We have witnessed, with grief unspeakable, the perversion, in this State, of our associations to purposes and objects not contemplated in our bond of union, foreign to our original objects, not necessary to their attainment, and, in the view of the reflecting, *fatal to our prospects of ultimate success.*" * * * " As abolitionists, we care not for it, [the equal rank of all persons, without distinction of sex, on the anti-slavery platform,] except as, by connecting it with our cause, *it becomes a mill-stone, to sink to the depths of a bottomless ocean the hopes of enslaved millions.*" * * * " The State [Anti-Slavery] Society is now fully identified with the sectarian (!) views of a few of its individual members. That the abolitionists of the Commonwealth generally sanction these proceedings, we have never believed. Nor do we question that they will come forward promptly to co-operate with us, in an association where the cause of the slave shall not only be paramount to every thing else, but *the only object* of its associated action." * * * " Is, then, the old pioneer society fallen? *Fallen it is indeed*, but we would hope it may rise again, and be clothed with strength, to plead for justice and judgement in behalf of the bondman. At present, it has *thrown away its principles*, and with them, *the staff of its power.*"

The following are some of the charges brought against the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society by the " ABOLITIONIST," the official organ of the new society :

" The theories of Mr. Garrison about religion and government only become matters of concern, because they seem to take out of

his hands, and out of the hands of the society, [meaning the Mass. A. S. Society,] which has virtually given them its sanction, the staff of accomplishment." * * * "The *no-government* party, [referring to the Mass. A. S. Society] would not grant us even the modified loop-hole resolution of Mr. St. Clair." * * * "The Massachusetts A. S. Society had decidedly refused to assert the duty of political action against slavery, even on the part of such as could conscientiously exercise the elective franchise; and it had as decidedly and practically encouraged the views of those who aim to change the customs of society, with regard to the sphere and duties of the female sex." * * * "Had the Massachusetts A. S. Society undertaken directly to *deny its foundation*, and *abandon its former course*, IT COULD NOT HAVE DONE IT MORE PALPABLY THAN IT HAS. *Its former position is now occupied by the new Society.*" * * * "The old Society, out of deference to the opinions of its *no-human government* members, declines to speak out what it thinks, STANDS GAGGED AND MUTE on the subject, and *lets the staff of efficiency pass from its hands.*" * * * "When we assumed the guiding quill of this sheet, we wrote that the Mass. A. S. Society, in suppressing its convictions in regard to the duty of political action, and thereby giving up its destinies to be moulded at will by a little minority of *non-resistants*, had suffered the staff of accomplishment to pass from its hands. *The charge is still true*, and none the less so, though it should prove to have come from imbecility itself." * * * "Shun those shoals and quicksands, which, but for the timely interference of the Mass. *Abolition* Society, had well nigh wrecked the old abolition ship, and drowned all the crew." * * * "Others may paint, and rig, and spread the sails of our good ship as she rides the billows; but *there are planks started in her bottom*, and it is all we can do to stop the leak." * * * "The Mass. A. S. Society must not express its conviction of duty, lest it should condemn the great pioneer of the enterprise." * * * "What will a voter care for being branded by a Society, [meaning the Mass. A. S. Society,] which admits that men have a right to throw off their allegiance to all earthly government, and go without it?" * * * "The difference between the old and the new anti-slavery organizations is this:—The new organization proposes to overthrow slavery *by the use of means*—the old, by simple *truth*. The new is like a doctor, who prescribed for a certain cutaneous disease, *faith and brimstone*: the old thinks it best to say nothing about the *brimstone*, because some people do not like the smell of it." * * * "The reason alleged by the founders of the Abolition Society for this movement is, that *the old Society has departed from the principles on which it was originally constituted.*" "We have no sort of predilection for old organization. Let us put our shoulders together, who mean really to *lift the wheel*, and be about it." * * * "Remember that, on the success of the Mass. *Abolition* Society depends, under God, *the success or failure of the anti-slavery enterprise in this State.*" * * * "If the old Society wishes to war upon us, let it. It is, and will be,

its ruin ; but, as we do not think *its prolonged existence* essential to the cause of human liberty, we have few tears to shed on the occasion." * * * " We did not set out to boast of the doing of the new Society, but to show that *the old stands in a position fatal to accomplishment*. The new Society may die to-morrow, and yet the efficiency of the old be not increased. The element of *non-resistance* that governs it, is like the *nux-vomica* of the doctors—it operates *an entire prostration of strength*." * * * " Without a third party, we have no doubt the new organization would continue to live *as the old one does*, passing resolutions, but *making no converts*, and *acting with no efficiency on politics* ; but that is precisely what we call *a gone case*."

To these charges of the officers and official organ of the Massachusetts Abolition Society, may be added the following from the lips of its agents and leading advocates, against our association. Says the Rev. Orange Scott:—

" Who, that is acquainted with the history of Wm. Lloyd Garrison, can doubt, that he has *ulterior ends in view* ? What has he *and the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society* done for the last two years, but to press his notions of perfectionism, his opposition to all human governments and institutions, his determination to crowd forward the women into all public stations and duties, and also to make a constant war upon all those who oppose these inconsistent and ridiculous notions ?" *

" The reasons which have led to this new organization, are summarily these. The 'Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society' had become so identified with *foreign* and *sectarian* matters, that many conscientious abolitionists could not give it their support. The *no-human government theory*, as it is called, had received, and was receiving, such *indirect sanction*, to say the least, *from that society*, both at its annual and quarterly meetings, that many of us felt compelled, *as we valued law and order, to say nothing of religion*, to abandon it." * * * " I rejoice at the formation of the Massachusetts Abolition Society. There were thousands in Massachusetts who had determined to go no farther with the old society. *That society is not what it was when we joined it*, and we had no disposition to *reform*, in the way that society has been *reforming* for some time past. If 'women's rights' and 'the no-human government theory' can free the slaves, others shall have the honor of making the experiment. We sail not under these colors, nor with men who make such matters leading considerations in their anti-slavery warfare." * * * *

" I rejoice in the formation of a new society in Essex county. Let this plan be carried out in every part of the Commonwealth, where a majority in the old societies have departed from original abolitionism." * * " I have no confidence in the present anti-slavery movements and measures of Wm. Lloyd Garrison and his particular party, [meaning the friends of the Mass. A. S. Society,] as a remedy for slavery ; for he destroys with one hand what he builds up with the other. I shall go no further either with him or the old society. I did not become a *dis-organizer* in becoming an abolitionist. Our principles and measures are the same now as when we joined the society—we have not left our brethren ; *they have left us*." * * * " I exceedingly regret that even

five members of the M. E. Church can be found in the whole of New England, disposed to sustain that *rotten-hearted no-human government, women's rights institution, called the 'Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.'*"

In a letter to the Board, resigning his seat as a member of it, the Rev. AMOS A. PHELPS says—

"The society is no longer an *Anti-Slavery Society, simply*, but in its *principles and modes of action* has become a *woman's rights, non-government Anti-Slavery Society*. While it remains such, I cannot consistently co-operate with or sustain it. When it shall have returned to its original character and principles, I shall rejoice to do so."

The Rev. DANIEL WISE, in giving an account for the press of the formation of the Massachusetts Abolition Society, says—

"At the news of this week, the poor stricken slave will rejoice. His cause in the old Bay State has been redeemed from the burden of many loads, placed upon it for some time past by those who were once its warmest friends. Pure, unmixed, genuine Christian abolition has now a medium through which it can stand forth unembarrassed before the piercing gaze of an inquiring community; in a word, my brother, a new State Anti-Slavery Society, based on the principles of original abolitionism, has been formed.

That the *time* for this organization had fully come, there can be no doubt. The previously existing society, by a base subserviency to the will of a few sectarians of recent date, had utterly shorn itself of its pristine strength." * * *

"This is the case with the old society in this State. It has brought in the measures of 'woman's rights men,' and of *no-governmentism*, and attempted to modify the action of its members, by the dictates of these follies. To these things there was known to be a deep, moral, and widely spread opposition. Still they were urged and jammed in, from the garrison of the society to the very tabernacles of abolitionists. The natural and only consequences to be expected, ensued—union was destroyed. Efficiency is of course gone to the winds of heaven, torn to a thousand rags.

Impressed with these facts, and unwilling to permit the abolitionism of the State to merge into the fog and error of non-resistance, and its destructive and unchristian consequences, the friends of the slave, of many sects and parties, have rallied anew under the old standard of principles.

Let us weep over the fall of the old society."

The same individual, in giving an account of the quarterly meeting of the Middlesex County A. S. Society, at Acton, says—

"A motion was made, inviting such *gentlemen* as were favorable to immediate emancipation to take seats as members, &c. This was resisted by the *non-resistants*, [meaning all those who wished to have no reference made to *sex* in the invitation.] The advocates of the tenets of Mary Wolstoncraft found themselves in a minority, and exceedingly chagrined, although two or three Amazons united to swell the numbers on their side. * * * With the afternoon session, commenced a

most disgusting movement, [i. e. a motion was made, and carried, that all *persons* friendly to immediate emancipation be invited to take seats, &c.] Despising such disorderly movements, those friends of the slave, who love his cause better than they love the violation of the laws of nature, of God, and of civil society, forthwith left the meeting, leaving a lean minority, of both males and females, to drink their fill at the putrid streams of no-government waters."

Giving an account of his labors as the agent of the Abolition Society, he says—

"One year's faithful labor, and Massachusetts is ours. The sons of the pilgrims will never lose their zeal for the slave in a quixotic crusade against governments."

The Rev. Alanson St. Clair, another agent of the Abolition Society, and once zealous for the equal action of all persons, irrespective of sex, in anti-slavery meetings, speaks of the friends of old organization, as follows :—

"Our women's rights, no-government, anti-slavery opponents."

The Rev. Charles T. Torrey, also an agent of the same Society, says—

"The heart of the commonwealth is sound to the core; but its soundness will not appear in giving its support to the follies into which the old society has been led." * * * "We have toiled with them in this cause as long as *honor* or *conscience* would permit us to keep company with them, and have now separated, that we might continue to assert all our *original principles*, and urge all our *original measures*, with new zeal and greater energy."

In a communication to the Editor of the Abolitionist, referring to the President of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society and the Editor of the Liberator, he says—

"Peace to their memories! or, rather, to the memory of their former fidelity to the slave, when as yet party objects had not led them astray from the plain path of honor and duty" !!

The Rev. Hiram Cummings, another agent of the same Society, writes to the editor of the Abolitionist—

"The tide of public feeling and sentiment is strongly flowing in favor of the new organization; the people generally, who are acquainted with all the circumstances, believe that such a society was necessary to save the 'noble ship Abolition' in this State from 'going down,' she being so heavily laden with a foreign, extraneous cargo, as to render her condition perilous, and to jeopardize all who have embarked in her noble enterprize."

Another agent of the Abolition Society, writing from Barnstable County, says—

"The County Society is *now* auxiliary to the American Anti-Slavery Society. The *Non-Resistant* agents of the old *Non-Resistance* Mass.

Anti-Slavery Society wish to change its auxiliaryship from the American to their State Society, for two purposes; *first*, to deprive the American Society, which the old State Society has been opposing for a year past, of its *support* from this county; and *second*, to get this County Society to support their old sinking State Society, which is fast 'going down,' being so heavily freighted with no-human-governmentism, that her condition is perilous; and, consequently, the true abolition crew have been obliged to escape and embark in the true *Abolition ship*; which is freighted with nothing but Abolitionism and her noble crew, gallantly outriding the tempest and storms of pro-slavery and non-resistance (!) fury—which have threatened her destruction—and bound directly for the port of emancipation. * * I am fully persuaded that the sensible part of the citizens of this county are 'not prepared to 'drink in, imperceptibly, the no-human-government doctrines;' or to support a society, by being auxiliary to it and contributing to its funds, *which is the great medium through which non-resistance is flowing.*"

In the formation of societies auxiliary to the Abolition Society, special pains have been taken to destroy, by libellous innuendoes, the character of the old Society. The following resolution was adopted by the Middlesex County Abolition Society:

"Resolved, That the cause of the slave, both from its nature and importance, should be one by itself, and every attempt to introduce foreign subjects, in connexion with it, is not only inconsistent with the unity of abolitionism, but extremely hazardous to the momentous interests of the slave."

At the organization of the State Abolition Society, the following resolution was adopted:

"Resolved, That we deem it necessary to present our cause before the community on its merits, unconnected, either in form or fact, with those sectarian and local or personal objects, which have been recently, to so great an extent, in this State, identified with it."

At the formation of the Groton Abolition Society, the following resolutions were adopted:

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, in having refused to affirm this doctrine, [respecting the use of the elective franchise,] when thus called upon to act, and when it was opposed by its no-human-government members, has let the staff of accomplishment fall from its hands, and virtually identified itself with the no-human-government sect.

Resolved, That we have not organized a new society in this place out of hostility to the old one, but because we believe that that society has done all that it ever can in this town towards abolitionizing its inhabitants; because that society has connected with its official action several extraneous, sectarian opinions, to which we are conscientiously opposed, in consequence of which we cannot act with it; and because we feel bound to devote our influence and means to the overthrow of slavery." *

* To show how well the practice of that society accords with its professions of zeal for the overthrow of slavery, it is only necessary to state,

The following resolution was adopted by an Abolition Society in Ashby :

“Resolved, That we heartily approve of the formation of the Massachusetts Abolition Society; and believing its existence essential to the deliverance of the cause of the slave from the grasp of sectarianism, (!) and to the well-being of the slave, do hereby solemnly pledge ourselves to lend it the aid of our prayers, our influence, and our means, so long as it continues true to the principles set forth in its constitution.”

In an address to the public of the Executive Committee of the Norfolk County Abolition Society, they say—

“If we suffer our efficiency to be destroyed, by identifying our cause, either in form or in fact, with the visionary efforts of a few to overthrow the foundations of social order, and tear up the frame-work of all human governments, and scatter their fragments to the winds, we not only render our cause contemptible in the eyes of men of sense and discernment, but we place the day of freedom to the slave at a hopeless distance, and suffer the staff of accomplishment to pass out of our hands.”

At the formation of the Worcester North Division Abolition Society, the following resolution was adopted :

“Resolved, That we deem it important to the prosperity of *pure, original, constitutional abolitionism*, that we organize a new society in Worcester North Division, auxiliary to the Massachusetts Abolition Society.”

The following was adopted in Worcester South Division :

“Resolved, That in the formation of the County Abolition Society, and in our co-operation with the State Abolition Society, our object is to present the abolition cause to the community, *separate from all extraneous topics*, and therefore in such a form and spirit, that *christian* (!) and humane men can *consistently* give it their hearty confidence and support.”

At a meeting of the New England Wesleyan Anti-Slavery Society, the following preamble and resolution were adopted, the Board understand without any discussion or consideration, and mainly through the influence of Rev. Orange Scott :

“Whereas, the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society has, by its recent action, become *identified with questions of a sectarian character*, and therein *departed from its original policy*; and whereas, many true friends of the slave have conscientious scruples about giving it their co-operation, in its present state; therefore

Resolved, That abolition societies, designed to embody all the abolition influence within a given territory, should be kept entirely distinct

that, although eighteen months have transpired since its formation, it has never held one meeting since that time, but has remained perfectly torpid up to the present hour !

from sectarian theories and party politics; and, therefore, we rejoice to learn, that a Massachusetts Abolition Society of this character has recently been formed."

In the *Emancipator* of March 12, 1840, the following accusations are made by the Editor—at that time the official mouth-piece of the American Anti-Slavery Society :

"It is plain, that the leading managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, in and around Boston, regard the non-resistance society as embracing the true anti-slavery principles, and the anti-slavery society as being a convenient resting place for those who have not yet attained their clearness of vision and perfection of liberty; and it follows, of course, that they will endeavor so to control the lower power as not to impede the progress of the higher."

These are specimens of the manner in which the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society has been assailed, and of the charges which have been brought against it, by persons who have been somewhat conspicuous in our enterprise, and by journals and societies which claim to be wholly consecrated to the cause of bleeding humanity. It will be seen that these charges are of a grave and vital character. If they are true, then it is undeniable that the Society has been guilty of widely departing from its appropriate sphere of action. If they are true, then it is certain that the moral honesty both of the Board and the Society stands justly impeached before the public. But **THEY ARE ALL FALSE**, and rest upon nothing but gross misrepresentation. In various addresses which they have issued, the Board have in the most explicit manner denied each and all of them, in behalf of the Society and themselves. The question, then, is one of veracity between the accused and the accuser. One party or the other is guilty of uttering falsehood. When a controversy is narrowed down to such an alternative, it becomes a very serious matter. But the truth must be told, justice awarded, and innocence vindicated, at whatever expense to individual or associate reputation. In an address of the Board to the abolitionists of the United States, issued in April last, they meet the "non-resistance" accusation as follows :

"The charge against the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, that it has become subservient to the principles of non-resistance, is utterly false. Whether those principles are right or wrong, *it lies not in the province of the Society to determine*. It has never, in any manner, directly or indirectly, given them its sanction. A very large majority of its members do not embrace them. Its resolutions on the subject of political action have ever been of the most uncompromising character.

Its addresses to the anti-slavery electors of the commonwealth, through its Board, have also been equally strong and emphatic. In short, it occupies precisely the same ground, on this subject, as other kindred associations. Its abolitionism, both morally and politically, is and ever has been of the purest and best quality, and marked by a vigor and an efficiency unsurpassed, if equalled, in any other State. We do not speak boastingly in its behalf; but when the worst calumnies are circulated against it, and it is falsely represented by some who wear an abolition garb to have fallen to the earth, we may be pardoned for asking, with some degree of complacency—What State is so well abolitionized as Massachusetts? What society contributes so much money to sustain the anti-slavery movement? Where has political abolitionism achieved such victories as in this State? What other legislature, besides that of Massachusetts, has demanded the immediate abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia? Upon what State has the parent society hitherto relied so confidently for aid as Massachusetts? The answers to these questions furnish the best refutations of the cruel aspersions which have been so profusely cast upon the society."

They define "the basis of anti-slavery fellowship" to be—

"Perfect agreement in opinion, that all men have an inalienable right to liberty; that to enslave a human being, or to retain him in slavery, under any circumstances, is an impious and cruel act; that it is the duty of the slaveholder immediately to relinquish his claim of property in man, and to liberate all whom he holds in bondage; that to colonize or proscribe any portion of the American population, on account of their complexion, is to insult Him who has made of one blood all nations of men, to violate the spirit and precepts of our holy religion, and to make war upon our common humanity."

And they add,—

"In the foregoing sentiments, persons of every sect and party can unite for the overthrow of slavery, in an associated capacity, and join hand in hand, and stand shoulder to shoulder upon common ground, without compromising any of their distinctive peculiarities, or having their liberty of conscience or of speech trammeled on any subject."

They represent the grand object of the anti-slavery organization to be—

"The abolition of slavery, and the improvement and elevation of our colored population. By what instrumentality? By the promulgation of the doctrine of immediate emancipation, and the application of truth to the consciences and hearts of a pro-slavery people. Not by exacting a conformity of views among the friends of emancipation, with regard to any theological or political dogma; not by arraigning any man for believing, or refusing to believe, in the divinity of the church or state; not by assuming that any existing civil or ecclesiastical government is either good or evil in itself; not by making it obligatory upon any abolitionist to be a voter at the polls, or a member of any religious denomination; not by refusing to give the right hand of fellowship to any man or body of men, on account of conscientious scruples entertained respecting subjects foreign to the anti-slavery enterprise. For, if any such test were required, it is certain that there could be no such thing as a union of all sects and parties for the overthrow of slavery; and it would be perfectly absurd to talk of a *common* platform of humanity. While, however, no member of our organization may attempt to con-

vert it either to his peculiar religious or political views, nor denounce those who do not embrace those views as abolitionists, he does not, nevertheless, by consenting to become a member of our organization, *surrender his right to proselytize to the extent of his ability, apart from abolitionism, as a man or a Christian—either as a member of any sect or party, or as one who stands aloof from all sects or parties*; provided, of course, he never makes the cause of bleeding humanity subordinate to any political or sectarian considerations, but bears a faithful and consistent testimony against the sin of slavery. A Methodist clergyman, for example, in joining an anti-slavery society, has no right to obtrude his views of Methodism upon it, with a design to give them currency; but, when not acting in the society, he has an indisputable right to make as many converts to his religious faith as possible; and no abolitionist may justly complain of his conduct."

They admit that moral and political action must be used for the overthrow of slavery, and illustrate this point as follows :

" Slavery pollutes the Church, and corrupts the State. In order, therefore, to effect its abolition, both Church and State need to be purified. It is the avowed object of the Anti-Slavery Society to enlist on the side of emancipation, 'moral and political action.' As the American people are upholding slavery by their religious and political power, it assumes that they are under the strongest obligations to use such power for the overthrow of that hideous system; i. e. it speaks in popular language, without meaning to concede, or deny, the inherent rightfulness of human governments or church establishments, *because it is not necessary for the Society to make any such concession or denial.* It predicates the duty of ecclesiastical or political action, not upon the inherent excellency of ecclesiastical or civil organizations, but upon the fact of their existence as props of the slave system, and upon the views and professions of those who are allied to them by choice.

Now, if the State cannot be purged from the stain of slavery, unless abolitionists go to the polls; neither can the Church, unless they connect themselves with it. But what would be the consequence, if it should be made an abolition test, that *every member of the Anti-Slavery Society is in duty bound to connect himself with the church, on the ground that such a connection is essential to its anti-slavery purification, and that abolitionists have pledged themselves to do all that is lawfully in their power for the abolition of slavery?* Discord and division throughout our extended ranks! The same disastrous effect, to a considerable extent, has already been produced by the attempt to introduce a political test of membership into the society.

In one thing abolitionists *are all perfectly agreed*, namely, that duty to God and humanity requires of them fidelity to their anti-slavery principles and professions, *in whatever sphere they may be called to act—in the church or out of it—at the ballot box, or away from it—in all places, under all circumstances, and at all times.* No other agreement is practicable, among those whose religious and political sentiments so widely differ—*none other is necessary to insure the onward progress of our sacred cause.* Why, then, should there be any collision in our ranks, in reference to any extraneous question?"

In an address of the Board to the agents of the Society, they say—

" It should be stated, as an unquestionable fact, that the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society has never departed from the original plat-

form on which the association was formed. Among its members, as in other anti-slavery societies, are a very few, who have conscientious scruples about actively sustaining any existing form of human government, though they think it a duty to submit to such government. With this opinion, the society has nothing to do. They have no more right to decide upon it, than they have upon one brother's opinion on baptism, or another's faith in universal salvation. If the present majority of the society may vote that the non-resistant members are bound in duty to go to the polls,—which is equivalent to saying that they are false to duty, if they decline going,—the non-resistants, if they should become a majority, may, with the same propriety, brand every voter as recreant to duty. No one questions the right of the majority of the society to see that such doctrines are announced, and such measures taken, as seem to them right, and calculated to promote our cause, let who will feel offended; but, they may not, under color of attacking slavery, pass an intended censure upon brethren, who are as sound as themselves upon the doctrine of immediate emancipation, and who are working for the slave, zealously and consistently, in every sphere of action in which they can conscientiously work at all. The moment we assume the principle of censuring a member, whose conscience forbids him to unite in any particular measure that the majority may happen to approve, we arrogate a power which was never conceded to us; we do our best to verify the charge brought against associations,—that their tendency is to tyrannize over individual conscience, and crush intellectual freedom. An effort is now making to compel every member of the anti-slavery societies, under the ban of the majority, to take part in certain specified modes of political action. This effort, like every other that encroaches on liberty of conscience, will not be submitted to, and can end only in division. It matters not that the penalty of disobedience to the edict of the majority is not physical, or that we do not formally expel the contumacious member from our meetings. We wrong him as cruelly as if we did. Every man of honor and sensibility feels a stain as a wound; and an unauthorized, *intended* censure from one's cherished associates is worse than a blow. The original principle of the anti-slavery association forbids them to take cognizance, in their associated capacity, of any individual member's opinions, except on the subject of immediate emancipation. This is the only point, on which we have pledged ourselves to uniformity of faith."

"*Non haec in fædera veni.* An anti-slavery association is not like a Christian church, whose province is the whole field of human duty. It is equally absolute within its sphere, but its sphere is prescribed by agreed limits; and an association like ours starts from its sphere, the moment it undertakes, on any pretence, to settle for individual conscience such questions as the duty of supporting civil government. Let those who doubt this, think what would be their indignant emotions, if a Quaker majority in an anti-slavery society should undertake to force through a vote, declaring it the solemn duty of every abolitionist to disband the church organization to which he belongs, and to testify against a paid ministry."

In meeting the charge that the Society has undertaken to settle the rights of woman, the Board say—

"We have been equally careful to avoid, as a society, *all interference with the disputed question of woman's sphere and capacity.* Our members have a perfect right to differ in opinion on this question; and with their opinions we have nothing to do. There is, in fact, a great variety of

sentiments held among ourselves, on the general question of woman's rights; but, *without deciding among them, or even taking cognizance of them*, this society has attempted, and we think successfully, to deal with the question of the rights of our female members, *in a practical, inoffensive, and common sense way*. Those members appeared at our meetings, and claimed the right to vote and speak. *Their right was questioned by some of the brethren who have seceded from us.* It thus became necessary to settle it. *We did not seek the question; it forced itself upon us*, and we must decide one way or the other. We turned to the constitution of our society. We there found that all persons, who were members of the society, had equal rights in its meetings. Unless, therefore, we were prepared to vote that women are not *persons*, we could not deny them the common privileges of membership. Sparingly as our sisters in the cause have exercised their right to speak, our acknowledgement that the right existed is put prominently forward as good cause for breaking up the anti-slavery organization in this State! And yet, strange to tell, the seceders from our ranks, (who declare that conscience will not permit them to act with us, while we allow women to take part in our meetings,) instead of retiring from the American Anti-Slavery Society, at its last annual meeting, when that society recognized, with at least equal fulness, the rights of its female members, satisfied their consciences with a simple protest, and have now so far got over their scruples, as actually to become its auxiliary, while that very sin lies unrepented upon its soul!

We forbear comment upon the inconsistency of this course, and the insincerity it seems to betray; for we are anxious to establish principles, not to war against men.

If one brother feels his conscience disturbed by a woman's speaking, another may plead that he is equally offended by her being silenced. In all such cases, when some decision must necessarily be made, the society should look first to its constitution; when that is silent, and only then, it may resort to its general views of right. If any brother is dissatisfied with the result, he may attempt to amend the constitution according to his own views, or he may protest against the action of the majority. If he insists on leaving the society on such ground, we can only say that *he is acting on a narrow principle, that would make all organized effort impossible, or very short-lived*; since there can never be, in any cause, a perfect consent on all subordinate topics and modes of action. We are astonished to hear it pretended, that if a woman speaks in an anti-slavery meeting, the responsibility is not her own, but rests upon every man in the assembly;—a guilt from which he cannot absolve himself by protesting against it, but only by breaking up the whole anti-slavery organization!

The original ground of this society, the first in the United States, was, that every person should be left free to advance the cause of the slave, in such manner as should be approved by his own conscience. *We simply decline changing this platform.* People of all sects, all colors, and both sexes, are free to work for the slave, as seems to them best. The only question this association asks, or according to its own principles has a right to ask, is, whether its members believe immediate, unconditional emancipation to be a duty, and are willing to labor for its advancement."

Appealing to the good sense and candor of those who have seceded from the State Society, the Board ask—

“Why should they treat as unpardonable in one society what they

wink at in another? Why make war upon an auxiliary society for doing that which is sanctioned by the parent society? Why single out the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society as worthy to suffer death, while other societies, equally guilty, (!) are not even arraigned for their conduct? If there be nothing personal, nothing sectarian, nothing ulterior, on the part of the seceders, why this strange inconsistency of conduct? In the Eastern (Penn.) Society, women have been enrolled as members, acted on committees, &c. But who has heard of any outbreak, in consequence, among the abolitionists of that State? Is there no 'conscience' on this subject in that quarter? If not, *why not?* In the same manner, women have actively participated in the proceedings of the Rhode Island Society; and they have also been received as delegates in the Connecticut Society. The Massachusetts A. S. Society stands precisely in the same attitude as the American Society, the New England Convention, the Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania and Ohio Societies; and, therefore, if it ought not any longer to be upheld by abolitionists, all the rest deserve to be treated in the same manner.

The Executive Committee of the Abolition Society ask in their Address—'What has this question to do with the deliverance of the bond-slaves of our country—whether, as a matter of right, females should exercise all the social, political and religious rights, discharge all the corresponding duties, and be subject to all the connected liabilities attached to them, equally with the other sex?' *No anti-slavery society has attempted to settle this question.* What rights women ought to enjoy in the church or in social life, or whether they ought to be allowed to use the elective franchise or be eligible to political office, *are questions which abolitionists have never attempted even to discuss;* they are foreign to the object they have in view, namely, the utter extinction of slavery.

The anti-slavery society is a voluntary association, of temporary duration, amenable to no ecclesiastical tribunal or political body. In deciding for itself the conditions of membership, it takes no cognizance of what is either allowed or prohibited by any other association. In allowing all *persons* who are hostile to slavery to enrol their names as members, and to open their mouths in the cause of the suffering and the dumb, it confines itself to 'its appropriate sphere,' and is doing its legitimate work. It does not necessarily endorse what is advanced by any speaker, and it throws the whole responsibility upon every *person* who takes any part in its proceedings.

It should be remembered, that the language of the resolutions which have been adopted by the Massachusetts Society, inviting individuals to participate in its proceedings, *has been in exact conformity with the terms of its constitution*—including all '*persons*' in favor of immediate emancipation, &c. The only offence, therefore, of which the society is guilty, is that of refusing to declare that women, who have complied with all the requirements of the constitution, are not '*persons*' within the meaning of that instrument! In other words, it will not *exclude* from a free participation in its proceedings, on account of their *sex*, '*persons*' who agree with it in principle, and cheerfully contribute to its funds! It will not say to its own annual and life-members, when they present themselves at its meetings, 'Stand aside—your sex renders it improper that you should act with us in our efforts to redeem the slave from his bondage!' In *principle*, therefore, the Society stands just where it has stood from the beginning—on the firm basis of its constitution."

It is for pursuing this catholic, magnanimous, constitutional course, "without partiality and without hypocrisy," in the

spirit of honesty and uprightness,—and for refusing to allow itself to be moulded by the spirit of personal rivalry and sectarian animosity,—that the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society has been assailed with such extraordinary virulence, and subjected to such a torrent of defamation. “The head and front of its offending hath this extent — no more.” The Society claims to stand or fall upon its official acts and publications, and cannot be justly held responsible for the opinions of any of its members. It is accused of being a non-resistant or non-government society, simply because some of its members are religiously opposed to taking any active participation in the affairs of government. As reasonably might it be called a Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Whig or Democratic Society, because persons connected with each of these sects and parties are also among its members. Not a sentence in favor of the peculiar doctrines of non-resistance can be found in any of its publications; nor has any resolution respecting that subject ever been discussed in any of its meetings. Our non-resistance brethren are as much opposed to its introduction on the anti-slavery platform as those who have seceded from our ranks; and in no instance, to our knowledge or belief, have they ever attempted to obtain the sanction either of this or any other anti-slavery society to non-resistance principles or measures. On the contrary, while they are giving their zealous and efficient support to our enterprise, they have marked out their own distinct course as non-resistants. They have formed themselves into a separate association by the title of the “**NEW ENGLAND NON-RESISTANCE SOCIETY**”—established an official organ of their own, called “**THE NON-RESISTANT**”—and sent forth their agents to propagate their sentiments, in the same manner as temperance and anti-slavery societies have done. This Society can no more be responsible for their operations, than for the proceedings of any other foreign association. They constitute but a very small portion of its members—though it is simply an act of justice to say, they are among the most zealous and faithful members.

The Board have not been able to suppress the feelings of surprise with which they have listened to the clanor which

has been raised against the free discussion of certain unpopular theories, lest it should prove detrimental to the cause of human liberty! In one of their official documents, therefore, they felt constrained to utter the following language both by way of rebuke and encouragement:

“We believe that the anti-slavery cause is founded upon a rock,—THE ETERNAL ROCK,—and cannot be overthrown. We blush at the want of faith in its divine organ and holy invincibleness exhibited by those professed abolitionists, who cry out against the free discussion, by individuals, of any question,—whether it relate to peace or war, a human or divine government, religion or polities, Church or State,—as endangering the life of our enterprise! Abolition thrives in exact proportion to the growth of free discussion on all moral and political subjects. The examination and discussion of no other question can possibly injure it. Its single object is to extirpate slavery from the American soil, and whatever is not oppressive in spirit has nothing to apprehend from its progress. It must and will prevail.”

The Society is charged by its rival as standing “mute and gagged” on the subject of political action, or in relation to the use of the elective franchise for the abolition of slavery! So far from this being true, it has been vigilant, active, uncompromising on this subject. In no other State in the Union, it is believed, is our cause so far advanced, either religiously or politically as in Massachusetts. What language can be more emphatic, or more admonitory, or more in accordance with the genius of the anti-slavery movement, than is contained in the following resolution, adopted by the Society in 1839, and for the adoption of which, (ridiculous as it may seem,) it was branded as a “non-government” society by the schismatics who were determined to rule or ruin it?

“Resolved, That those abolitionists, who feel themselves called upon, by a sense of duty, to go to the polls, and yet purposely absent themselves from the polls whenever an opportunity is presented to vote for a friend of the slave—or who, when there, follow their party predilections to the abandonment of their abolition principles—are recreant to their high professions, and unworthy of the name they assume.”

On the old anti-slavery platform, as maintained by the State Society, all human beings are allowed to meet on equal terms for the overthrow of slavery. They are required to agree in nothing but the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding, and in the duty of immediately letting the oppressed go free. On the new platform, as laid down by the Massachusetts Abolition So-

ciety, a theological creed is imposed, to the exclusion of one half of the human family, on account of their sex,—and a political creed is enforced, to the banishment of thousands of devoted abolitionists, on account of their religious scruples against participating in the politics of the country. In the face of this undeniable fact, the Executive Committee of the Abolition Society, in their address to the public, have the extraordinary folly and effrontery to accuse the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society of being actuated by a sectarian spirit! They say—

“ The charge of sectarianism has not been made without reflection. Let the case be put very simply. Two men desire to unite in the promotion of a given object. They agree in reference to the principles and measures involved in it. They disagree on other topics. If *either* party insist upon introducing, or asking sanction for his views on the topics of difference, *he is a sectarian*. This our brethren have done, in regard to the ‘woman’s rights’ and ‘no-government’ views. We agreed on anti-slavery. We did not agree on the other topics. We united to promote anti-slavery, and nothing else. They insisted upon a sanction of their views on women’s rights, and then on the subject of political action. They obtained their wishes, in spite of our private and public remonstrances and exertions. *They have made their association a sectarian thing, and because we were not sectarian, (!!) we withdrew from it.*”

A more severe condemnation of the schismatical course adopted by this Committee and their associates, could not easily be written, than is contained in the above exposition of the anti-slavery platform; nor could a better panegyric be passed upon the conduct of the State A. S. Society. “ We agreed on anti-slavery,” say the Committee. True—and the agreement was perfect: how inexcusable, then, is their new organization! “ We united to promote anti-slavery, and nothing else.” True—and if to allow all persons to use their influence for the overthrow of the iniquitous slave system, in accordance with law, humanity and religion, without stopping to ask their sex or examine their complexion, be not “ to promote anti-slavery, and nothing else,” then we know not how it can be done. “ We did not agree on other topics.” True—and this we all knew before we associated ourselves together as an abolition band. Our ranks were filled up with persons perfectly agreed “ in reference to the principles and measures involved” in the one object to be accomplished, and widely discordant in their views “ on other topics.” Those PRINCIPLES,

in the language of the National Anti-Slavery Declaration, “forbid the doing of evil that good may come, and lead us to reject, and to entreat the oppressed to reject, the use of all carnal weapons for deliverance from bondage—relying solely upon those which are spiritual, and mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds.” Those MEASURES are “such only as the opposition of moral purity to moral corruption, the destruction of error by the potency of truth, the overthrow of prejudice by the power of love, and the abolition of slavery by the spirit of repentance.” In the advocacy of such principles, and the use of such measures, every person heartily opposed to the enslavement of any portion of the human race could unite. But “they [the Massachusetts A. S. Society] insisted upon a sanction of their views on women’s rights, and then on the subject of political action.” The reverse of this statement is true! It is the *Abolition* Society that has undertaken to settle “extraneous topics,” about which abolitionists do not and probably never can entirely agree; and hence it is, in the bad sense of that term, a “sectarian” movement. The State A. S. Society has never attempted to determine “the rights of women,” nor allowed the question to be entertained in its meetings or discussed in its publications. It strictly adheres to its one grand design—“the promotion of anti-slavery, *and nothing else.*” It simply defines what qualifications are necessary to membership, and makes those qualifications so simple that all human beings may possess and exercise them, without travelling out of their “appropriate sphere,” or interfering with their religious or political opinions;—*and there it leaves the matter.* On the subject of “political action,” it constantly inculcates the doctrine, that anti-slavery should be made the paramount question at the polls, to the sacrifice of all mere party considerations, by all those who wield the elective franchise,—and that it is highly inconsistent for abolitionists to vote for slave-holders or pro-slavery candidates; but it does not make it a part of the anti-slavery creed to believe in the duty of every man to mingle or not to mingle in the political conflicts of the country—for that is an “extraneous topic.” The Society could occupy no other ground without being “sectarian,” and ing its own platform.

It is an undeniable fact, that *the new organization is guilty of every act that it falsely charges upon the old.* A secession took place in New Hampshire, in June last, from the State Anti-Slavery Society, and an abolition society was formed to supplant it, on the ground of its meddling with "extraneous" matters. The constitution of the society is unlike any thing known in the progress of our enterprise until the recent schism. It establishes a religious test respecting church organizations, a political test respecting human government, and a sectarian test respecting the inferiority of woman!!! The following comments upon this anomalous document are from the pen of the clear-sighted and faithful editor of the Herald of Freedom, NATHANIEL P. ROGERS :

"We give all in the constitution bearing on these questions; and now what is their abolitionism? Is it merely that slaveholding is a sin against God and a crime against man, and ought to be immediately done away—as they have pretended? Or have they incorporated into it, with this, all their sectarian and party dogmas and opinions on other and extraneous and foreign and heterogeneous topics, which, if introduced, necessarily blows up the old anti-slavery platform?

They 'drag' in here the following extraneous opinions :

1st. That human government rightfully exists, by divine authority and approval. Not republican government merely, but all sorts. Not New Hampshire government only, or United States government—but all forms of domination of man over man, from the Cæsars down to President Van Buren and Gov. Page. This every Merrimac county abolitionist must hold to, or he cannot be admitted to the society. And if this must be held to, it must be advocated in the meetings, and by the press, and the lecturer in the meeting-house, (which is readily opened for this purpose.)

2d. That human government is bound to protect the weak, viz: every body not strong enough to protect himself—not the weak *slave* only, but all sorts of 'feeble folk,' and not against the *slave-master* only, but against all strong people against whom weak ones need protection—that *all* weakness should be protected against *all* hurtful strength—the world over.

3d. That human government is bound to restrain the oppressive and lawless, of every sort, and by all necessary means—by imprisonment, fine, corporal and capital infliction, for every kind of oppression, and all sorts of omission to keep all sorts of laws—to restrain so far as to prevent the oppression and the lawlessness of the lawless. A pretty broad abolition doctrine—all right enough in a General Court or Court House, or gaol, it may be—but rather extraneous to anti-slavery, according to our old organized notions.

4th. That the church organizations of the day are God's ordained means of overthrowing sin.

5th. That such organizations are bound to exert themselves for the spread of truth in respect to all human sins. This last is rather indirectly asserted, but still it is asserted, and in a deliberately adopted article of a *professed* anti-slavery constitution.

6th. They indirectly at least assert the inferiority and incapacity of woman, by curtailing her sphere of action, and denying her the competency of any active or honorable participation in the business of an anti-slavery meeting. This is their anti-slavery. These are their anti-slavery objects and purposes. Their platform is thronged with the opinions and dogmas of their sects and parties; and every one not subscribing to them is excluded. This is what we have charged them with. They have denied it, and strangely charged it upon us, when they knew the charge was groundless. Here is their ground of seceding. Now it is not pertinent or material whether they hold rightly on these questions, or wrongly. The pertinent fact is, that they incorporate their opinions upon them into abolitionism. As abolitionists, we of the old society deny that anti-slavery settles or agitates any of them. As abolitionists, we agitate (or rather settle) the 'woman question' *so far only as this*—we do not question woman's right to equal action with man *in the anti-slavery movement*. She acts in our movement as she sees fit—and we hold her constitutionally competent to do so, equally with men. Further than this we say nothing—and we say this only by our constitution, which, like part of new organization's, admits all persons alike, and by our action under that constitution. That we have the right constitution in that, (as in other particulars,) 'we hold to be self-evident.' We seek the abolition of a capricious human domination over humanity. We seek it in a way agreeable to our object. We do not seek it in a *domineering* way or spirit, which those betray who tyrannize over women in this movement. But our object here is to confound new organization out of its own mouth and mouth-piece, against ever again charging us with dragging in extraneous topics, and to fix upon its brazen front the charge of making anti-slavery the handmaid of sect."

In this unhappy controversy, it should never be forgotten that the very individuals who are now so boisterous in their opposition to the equal position of women on the anti-slavery platform, (including all, or nearly all the members of the late Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society,) were the loudest in their approval of the public labors of ANGELINA E. and SARAH M. GRIMKE! These devoted women constantly lectured to promiscuous assemblies, in public halls and meeting-houses, and even in the State House before a large proportion of the Senators and Representatives of the Commonwealth; but who among genuine abolitionists, at that time, thought of denouncing their course, or seceding from the anti-slavery organization on that account? Were not the grateful benedictions of the friends of the down-trodden slaves showered upon their heads? Were not their labors owned and blessed of Heaven beyond those of any other lectures, however gifted or eloquent? Did they not call down upon themselves the scorn and anathemas of all that was pro-slavery in the land,

for thus presuming to act out of their "appropriate sphere?" And are not the language and spirit of our seceding opponents in relation to the free action of woman in our cause precisely the same as were then exhibited by the unrelenting enemies of God and his suffering poor? Is not their present position the one occupied by pro-slavery in 1836—7, and does it not prove that they have become thoroughly transformed in the temper of their minds, for the worse, and not for the better? "For what concord hath Christ with Belial," or genuine abolitionists with pro-slavery scorners?

To show who they are that have departed from the Anti-Slavery platform, as originally constituted, the Board would present the following editorial article on the subject of women speaking in promiscuous assemblies, which appeared in the Emancipator of April 10th, 1837, the official organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society :

THE MISSES GRIMKE.

We understand that these ladies addressed an audience a few evenings since, at Lowell, of 1500 persons, a large proportion, but by no means all, of whom were females. They were heard, as they have been elsewhere, with the greatest attention and manifest effect.

Yet in spite of this success, there are not wanting those, even among abolitionists, who doubt the propriety of their addressing promiscuous assemblies. These ladies do not go out as agents of the American A. S. Society, nor in any way connected with it; yet, for ourselves, we could fully justify the Society in sending them to do just what they are doing. It must be remembered that the American A. S. Society is not a sectarian institution, but is made up of all sects, and appeals to all to plead the cause of the slave, each in its own way. *In employing females of the Society of Friends to lecture, it would be guilty of no innovation. We do not see how members of other sects could object to it, any more justly, than to admitting Friends as members.*

We are aware that the Massachusetts General Association of Congregational Ministers has taken ground against the mistaken conduct of those who encourage females to bear an obtrusive and ostentatious part in measures of reform, and countenance any of that sex who so far forget themselves as to itinerate in the character of public lecturers and teachers.

We suppose the General Association can reconcile this with the following resolution, which they passed at the same meeting :

"Resolved, That we approve of free and candid discussion on the subject of slavery, and also of all other proper methods of diffusing light and promoting correct moral sentiment, which may have an influence to do away the evil."

The Association would certainly do the world a favor by informing it what are "proper methods." Is it proper for the Miss Grimkes to speak to gentlemen in a private parlor, *with their own permission?* Is it in the stage coach and steamboat? in a hired hall? in a district school-room, if they must be forced out from the sacredness of the pulpit cush-

ions? May they use the pen, if denied the tongue? Those who have made themselves the special guardians of female manners should answer many such questions.

It ought to be observed, also, that the Miss Grimkes have not only the sanction of the religious body to which they belong, but they have actually been obliged, by the importunity of the men of Massachusetts, to admit them to their lectures, which they designed to confine to their own sex. *Who will lay a straw in the way of their able and effective advocacy of the rights of the poor victims of our own christian oppression?*

It is needless to make any other comment upon the above, than that the author of it is believed to have been ELIZUR WRIGHT, Jr., until recently the editor of the "Massachusetts Abolitionist," and one of the most prominent seceders from the old organization!

Still further to show the duplicity of the "Abolition Society," in charging upon the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and its Board of Managers, an approval of the non-resistance doctrines, because they refuse to denounce those abolitionists who embrace those doctrines, we give below an official Address to the Public, issued in 1837 by the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, with express reference to the diversity of sentiments existing among abolitionists on the subject of non-resistance. It explains in a brief, but clear and very admirable manner, the exact position which is now occupied by the State A. S. Society—the nature and scope of the anti-slavery organization—the freedom of thought, speech and action, on every conceivable subject, that belongs to abolitionists as moral and accountable beings—and the responsibilities which justly attach to the National Society and its auxiliaries:

TO THE PUBLIC.

The Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society have heretofore candidly and explicitly stated the doctrines maintained by that association, and they are now induced to caution their fellow-citizens not to confound their doctrines with such as individual members may occasionally advance.

The constitution, after setting forth the principles of the Society, declares, that whoever consents to these principles, not being a slaveholder, may, on making a pecuniary contribution, become a member. Hence, good faith obviously requires, not only that those who enter the Society should sincerely embrace its avowed principles, but also that ~~THE SOCIETY SHOULD ABSTAIN FROM ALL INTERFERENCE WITH SUCH OTHER PRINCIPLES AS MAY BE HELD BY ITS MEMBERS.~~ *Of course, no member is required by his connection with the Society, to refrain from expressing (on his own responsibility) his individual opinions on any subject whatsoever. We believe there is among the abolitionists, a most cordial and unanimous assent to*

THE GREAT MORAL TRUTHS PROCLAIMED IN OUR CONSTITUTION, while on many other and important topics, they maintain very opposite and irreconcileable sentiments.

Some of these sentiments being promulgated in anti-slavery papers, and advocated by one or more abolitionists, have been used to prejudice the anti-slavery cause. ~~UPON~~ THE SENTIMENTS ALLUDED TO, THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HAVE NO AUTHORITY TO SIT IN JUDGMENT: ~~UPON~~ but, whether true or false, they receive no sanction from the Society, and every member is at liberty to assail or defend them.

While the committee assume no control over the private opinions of their agents, and much less over the course which independent friends of the cause think fit to pursue, they cheerfully acknowledge their obligation not to permit the funds of the Society to be used for the promotion of any principles or objects whatever, except those specified in the constitution; and it will ever be, as it ever has been, their determination, both in regard to the agents they employ, and the publications they issue, to avoid any just censure in this respect.

The great diversity of sentiment entertained by abolitionists, on political and religious subjects, instead of being, as our enemies vainly imagine, an indication of our weakness, is a demonstration of our strength, and an omen of our ultimate triumph. That cause cannot belong to a sect or a party, which is espoused by men of all sects and of all parties. The rights for which we are contending, are the rights of our common nature, and their advocacy cannot safely be committed to any sect or party, nor can any sect or party be exempted from rebuke, which takes the attitude of hostility to these rights.

In behalf of the Executive Committee,

E. WRIGHT, JR. Cor. Sec'y.

Thus fell to the ground all the slanderous charges that have been brought against this Society as a “woman’s rights, non-government rotten-hearted institution!” Thus is it triumphantly shown that all the blame for the divisions that exist in our ranks must rest upon those who have gone out from us because they are no longer of us, and who have lost the power of abolitionism, though they still retain its form.

In thus exhibiting the “new organization” in its true character; and exposing the duplicity of its MANAGERS, OFFICIAL ORGAN, and AGENTS, the Board by no means intend to be understood as impeaching the motives or condemning the spirit of all who are connected with that hostile movement. As among the supporters of the American Colonization Society, there were many who were ignorant of its principles and designs, and really supposed it was a most benevolent institution, though its officers and leading advocates were without excuse; so, doubtless, there are some who have been deceived by the calumnies so extensively circulated against the Massachusetts A. S. Society, and who honestly believe that the Abolition Society is actuated by a sincere desire to promote the best interests of the cause of emancipation. And as the Coloniza-

tion Society was abandoned by its disinterested friends, as soon as its moral deformities were revealed to their vision; so will this "new organization" be repudiated by all its well-meaning supporters, on their discovering the deception which has been imposed upon their credulity. They only are deserving of condemnation, who know whereof they affirm, who cannot plead purity of intention through ignorance of the facts in the case, and who are the prime movers in the unholy work of division.

The seceders from the old platform plead in justification of their course, that they conscientiously believe that women ought to be silent in anti-slavery meetings, and not be allowed to participate in the management of our enterprize; hence, they have chosen to prosecute their labors for the extinction of slavery in a separate society. In answer to this plea, the Board would remark —

1. They were not required to change their belief, or violate their consciences, on this point, by acting in the old organization. If they were unwilling to allow unrestrained freedom of speech to every member, they had a right to enter their protest against it; and having thus exonerated themselves from all responsibility in the matter, no one could justly accuse them of sanctioning the practice. The fact that they found themselves uniformly in the minority did not justify their secession; for the decision did not relate to the fundamental principles and measures of the Anti-Slavery Society, (in which the whole body of members were professedly agreed) but simply to the constitutional right of those who belonged to the Society, without distinction of sex, to advocate those principles and measures in its regular meetings. In an organization like ours, composed of persons belonging to almost every religious sect and political party in the land, nothing can be more plain than the obligation that rests upon them, as a united body, to waive their distinctive peculiarities or differences of opinions on other subjects, and to be at least tolerant toward each other, if they cannot heartily approve of every transaction. If it be a good reason why those who are opposed to the free action of woman should secede from the Anti-Slavery Society, because their wishes in this particular cannot be gratified; then a secession on the part of such of our members as belong to the Society of Friends might be justified, because anti-slavery meetings are generally opened with formal prayer. A new organization can be vindicated, if the old has changed the fundamental principles of its constitution, so that it no

longer maintains the inherent sinfulness of slavery, and the duty of immediate emancipation; or if the seceders avow that they have changed *their* principles, and are no longer immediatists, but gradualists;—and on no other grounds. But it is not pretended by those who have left us, either that any such alteration has been made in the constitution of our Society, or that they are no longer the friends of immediate emancipation.

2. If they have felt it to be their duty to act in a separate capacity, in obedience to the dictates of their consciences, they ought to remember that the majority whom they have left also profess to be equally conscientious. If, then, they are the sincere and disinterested friends of our great enterprize, and desire to hail its speedy accomplishment,—if they have no selfish, personal or sectarian feelings to gratify,—why are they not as willing to allow us to pursue the even tenor of our way, in accordance with our convictions of duty, as they are ready to claim the right to do so for themselves? But,

3. What has been their spirit? what their procedure? what their policy? Having withdrawn themselves from our ranks, and formed a distinct association, have they consecrated their time, talents and means to the cause of emancipation, and permitted us to do all the good in our power? Or have they been unwearied in their efforts to cripple the operations of our Society, to blacken its character, to render it hideous in the eyes of community, to alienate its friends, to asperse the motives and misrepresent the purposes of its board of managers, and to estrange and cut off its auxiliary societies? Let the overwhelming amount of evidence that has been adduced from their official acts and documents answer! And if they did these things in the green tree, what have they not done in the dry? If, in the most formal and public manner, they have not scrupled officially to bring the most flagrant and scandalous accusations against the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, what have they not been disposed to say and do in secret, in order to effect their base purposes? They have, in very many instances,—as a multitude of witnesses stand ready to testify,—endeavored to blast the private and religious character of prominent members of the Society, alleging that some are infidels, others opposed to all government others in favor of the annihilation of the sacred institution of marriage, others dishonest men! They have also endeavored to stir up sectarian animosity against the Board, by representing it

as almost exclusively Unitarian ! As if this last charge, were it true, (which it is not, nor are any of the others,) furnished any ground for secession from an *anti-slavery* body, a very large majority of the members of which are known to be what is technically called "orthodox" in their religious opinions ! In short, their grand object has been not to abolish slavery, but that society which is more hated and feared by southern slaveholders than any other local association in the republic. It would be a miracle indeed, if, after expending so much labor, and using such unholy instruments and resorting to such malignant devices, they had not effected their purpose, to a considerable extent. But success, obtained in this manner is sure to be of temporary duration. In due time, all things shall be made manifest in the light, and whatever is opposed to truth shall perish.

"Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again ;
 The eternal years of God are hers :
 But Error, wounded, writhes in pain,
 And dies among his worshippers."

It has been artfully attempted, by its enemies, to make the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society responsible for the peculiar religious and political views of Mr. Garrison, and for all the sentiments that are advanced in the *Liberator* on other subjects besides slavery. This charge is equally absurd and groundless. The Society is no more responsible for those views and sentiments, than it is for the rolling of the spheres, or for any other event over which it has no control. It is due to Mr. Garrison to say, that no one has labored more assiduously than himself to keep the anti-slavery enterprise distinct from every other, and to avoid the introduction of "extraneous" matters. Whatever may be his religious opinions, or his notions of the existing governments of the world, the Society has never been called upon to give them its approval. He alone is responsible for their promulgation ; and he has, undeniably, the same right to endeavor to convert others to his way of thinking, as is claimed and exercised by those who would put a gag into his mouth. *The Liberator has never been the official organ of this or of any other society.* It is an independent paper, under the exclusive control of its editor, and for the management of which he claims to be wholly answerable. It is still, as it has been from its commencement, almost entirely devoted to the subject of slavery. In the department which is appropriated to the discussion of Peace, in its columns, any person can be freely heard on the subject, pro

or con. In opening that department, Mr. Garrison, after making an exposition of his sentiments to the public, explicitly remarked—

“These are among the views we shall offer in connection with the heaven-originated cause of Peace,—views which any person is at liberty to controvert in our columns, and for which, *no man or body of men is responsible but ourselves*. If any man shall affirm that the anti-slavery cause, as such, or any anti-slavery society, is answerable for our sentiments on this subject, to him may be justly applied the apostolic declaration, **THE TRUTH IS NOT IN HIM.**”

In dismissing this subject, the Board would again quote the language of an eminent advocate of emancipation,* who, in a very brief compass, exposes the folly and injustice of those who charge upon the anti-slavery movement the peculiarities of the Liberator and its editor :

What is this secession, which is so madly prosecuted, and which leads our new organized brethren to persecute the poor, old anti-slavery enterprise, even unto strange cities beyond the water? What is it and its occasion? Why, certain men, who were “leading abolitionists,” could not labor side by side with the pioneer of the movement, because he would *keep it an unpopular and disreputable movement in the eyes of the world*. Garrison is the occasion of the secession. He will not content himself with the one heresy of immediate emancipation; but must be ever and anon broaching others. The community had become familiarized somewhat with that, and were ceasing to mob it; and it was even growing respectable; when, lo! he proclaims other heresies, and throws back the cause upon the contempt of the “*judicious*” community. Not that he mingles any of his *new* heresies with the *old* one, which the seceders had embraced, but *community* does. They identify the new heresies with anti-slavery, and the anti-slavery cause with Garrison. And we cannot keep them separate in the public mind. This is equivalent to Garrison’s identifying them; and, in short, he *does* identify them, and is guilty of the offence in the estimation of community. The seceders admonished him of these things, and enjoined upon him the necessity of his remaining “of one idea,” that they might respectably and speedily carry on the movement to a triumph. He gave no heed to their admonitions, but accused them of unfaithfulness to the cause. They preferred seceding to undertaking their defence, and so they new organized; and the land and all christendom is disturbed with the secession.

What are the complaints? Why, “Garrison encumbers the cause with extraneous topics.” Allowing that he does, who has a right to secede for that? *Cannot the anti-slavery cause be vindicated because Garrison encumbers it?* Suppose he does encumber it, could not all these seceders *disencumber* it? Is Garrison old anti-slavery, that they should secede from it, on *his* account? But, Garrison does not encumber it. We defy all new organization to show that he does, or that he is willing they should. But “the Liberator discusses extraneous topics.” What then? The Liberator is not an anti-slavery organ. *It is Garrison’s own free paper.* If it be not a true anti-slavery paper, among other things, let it be discountenanced by abolitionists. But if it were a very sink of heresies, it does not in the least warrant new organizing the Anti-Slavery Society. But Garrison makes it a commanding and influential paper. Strip him of his talents, then; but do not new organize our anti-slavery

* N. P. Rogers, editor of the New Hampshire Herald of Freedom.

movement. The Liberator is not *exclusively* devoted to the abolition of southern slavery. Yet it has more anti-slavery effect than all our abolition periodicals put together. The field around it is the best abolitionized of all the land. There is no anti-slavery camp like old Massachusetts. The standard most mortally alarming, of all others, to the slaveholder's eye, floats over Boston—not from the dome of the State House, but the flag-staff that shoots from the recesses of Cornhill—from “No. 25”—the ever-to-be remembered head-quarters of the great anti-slavery movement of the age. That humble spot, with all its *extraneosities*, is the grand centre of alarm to slavery and pro-slavery, and the Liberator is its ensign, and over it rests the North Star of hope to the reviving bondman!

“But Garrison does not hold that there is a Christian Sabbath.” He holds nothing about it, one way or the other, *as an abolitionist*; nor has any one a right to, pro or con. The Christianity of a Sabbath is not to be denied or maintained, in the *anti-slavery Society*, any more than the divinity of circumcision. That is not the purpose or business of the society. It is an extraneous question, and as *extraneous* to argue one side of it as the other. In the Liberator, however, it may be argued, in all good faith, on both sides. But “Garrison is a woman's rights man,” and that is “extraneous;” and besides, St. Paul does not hold with him. Whether Paul holds with him or not, or how he holds, or how any body holds on that subject, is extraneous. It is as extraneous to hold that woman has *no* rights, as to hold the contrary. Gentlemen forget that. They think that only one side of these questions is extraneous. The *other* side is quite intrinsic, and they may make the anti-slavery platform the theatre of maintaining the *right* side of every known question. It is *one* side of a topic that is extraneous, *viz.* the wrong side. Now we humbly say, that the general question of woman's rights is not admissible to anti-slavery decision. The right of woman in an *anti-slavery meeting* is pernicious anti-slavery matter, and whoever questions her equal right there, ought to be met there and put down. Usage, nor sectarian interpretations of Paul have any right to creep into our economy. And it would be odd enough to see professed abolitionists practising usurpation in an anti-slavery meeting. What do they demand of the slaveholder, but freedom to the slave, on the principle of mankind's universal, equal right to freedom? And shall they trample on that principle, while they are *urging* it?

But “Garrison is a no-human government man.” He is not an *anti-slavery* no-human government man, nor have the advocates of the human right of government any right to be such, *as abolitionists*. They may battle for and against the divine right of kings and presidents elsewhere, as much as they please, and it will not touch them as abolitionists. The seceders *do* raise the question, and sift it into their abolitionism, and in New Hampshire have made it part of their abolition confession of faith. They have incorporated it into their Constitution, after having seceded from the old society, who did *not* entertain the question, under pretext that it *did*. A member of the New Hampshire Aboition Society must not only subscribe to immediate emancipation, but to the *duty of being a politician*.

But, Garrison is a non-resistant—an enemy to the church and ministry, and to all society; and, in short, is an extraneous, “sifting” infidel, besides having “ulterior aims.” *The anti-slavery society is answerable for none of these things, if they were ever so true;* and they would be no good cause of secession—and they are not the cause of it. Men have seceded; some from love of sect, some from love of party, some from love of clerical “influence,” some from personal revenge, because their mo-

tives were detected and exposed, and some because they could neither manage Garrison nor anti-slavery, while they were associated with him. "They can't work with Garrison." They will work with each other, however they may differ, and they do differ on all these topics! They will not secede from each other, but they "can't work with Garrison." They are some for third party, and some not; some for assigning woman her sphere—giving her a negro pew in the great human family place of worship—a Liberia, "where she can rise sky-high;" others say they allow her to fix her own sphere. They differ about all these causes of secession, yet they secede *together* and remain *together—for the present*.

In consequence of the divisions which have taken place in this Commonwealth—the extraordinary and exhausting efforts which were made to redeem the pledge of ten thousand dollars to the National Society in 1839—and the suspicion and distrust which have been so widely excited against this Society—it has not been possible for the Board to carry on the operations of the Society, during the past year, so efficiently or vigorously as they could have desired. But, though they have been unable to "make bricks without straw," they have endeavored to make the best use of the means in their possession for the promotion of the anti-slavery enterprise. Since the last annual meeting, the receipts into the treasury have amounted to upwards of nine thousand dollars, and the expenditures to nearly the same amount. Of the expenditures, a considerable portion has been paid to the agents in the employment of the Society, for the past and preceding year. Among those agents have been Philo C. Pettibone, W. R. Chapman, Sumner Lincoln, Ezra C. Smith, Philemon R. Russell, J. S. Brown, James C. Jackson, N. H. Whiting, George Foster, Richard Hood, George Bradburn, T. P. Ryder, W. L. Garrison, John Jones, J. P. Bishop, C. M. Burleigh, J. D. Herrick, J. G. Duryee, S. S. Foster, Parker Pillsbury, Edwin Thompson. all of whom have labored with zeal and fidelity during the period of their engagement. The summer months being an unfavorable time for lecturing, it was deemed expedient, as a matter of economy, and to relieve the Society from its load of pecuniary embarrassment, not to keep any other person in the field but the General Agent. Of the industry, perseverance, energy and devotedness of Mr. Collins, in the prosecution of his labors, the Board would speak in terms of commendation. In the afflicting bereavement which he has been called to suffer by the sudden death of his wife and child, they deeply sympathize. By his arduous efforts, he had so seriously impaired his own health as to be almost wholly disabled from sustaining the responsibilities of his agency; and it was therefore deemed advisable for him to make a transatlantic

tic voyage, in order, if possible, to recruit his shattered constitution. Accordingly, with the unanimous advice and consent of the Board, and also supplied with letters of recommendation from them and the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society to the friends of emancipation in Great Britain, Mr. Collins sailed from New York for London, in the British Queen, on the 1st of October. News of his safe arrival has been received; but the Board regret to state that his health does not appear to have been benefitted by the voyage. In connexion with his absence in quest of physical restoration, he was deputed to act, as far as his strength would permit, in behalf of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and to obtain for it such pecuniary and other assistance as the anti-slavery public in Great Britain might be disposed to contribute. From the intelligence communicated in his letters, it appears that he is not likely to succeed, to any considerable extent, on the score of pecuniary aid owing to various causes; but especially to the fact, that the virus of "new organization" has poisoned the minds of the leading abolitionists in that country, and led them to regard with distrust those societies in the United States, which, as they suppose, have other objects in view than the abolition of slavery. They have been grossly imposed upon by the same falsehoods and calumnies which have been circulated so industriously on our own shores against the Parent Society and its auxiliaries; and, if they are animated by the generous and catholic spirit which should mark an enterprise like ours, it is only necessary for them to be furnished with all the facts in the case, to see and repudiate the error into which they have been led. As honest and impartial men, they are bound to hear all sides before they make up their verdict. This disposition, the Board regret to state, they have not, as yet, been disposed to manifest.

It is somewhat uncertain how long Mr. Collins will be absent; but his return may be expected in the course of a few weeks. All the facts in regard to his mission will then probably be communicated in detail to the public.

Deprived of the services of their General Agent, needing his advice and co-operation, and feeling reluctant to augment the pecuniary embarrassments of the Society, until they could obtain an expression of its feelings and desires at the annual meeting, which was then rapidly approaching, the Board have deferred the employment of agents, and, consequently, the Society is under no present liabilities on that score. It is certainly desirable, however,

that the present favorable season for lecturing should be immediately improved ; and if the Society will pledge itself to sustain the Board in sending lecturers into the field, they will hasten to engage the most suitable persons that can be obtained for that purpose. They dread and deplore a state of inactivity ; it is unworthy of those who profess to be abolitionists ; it is a reproach to the cause of human suffering and degradation ;—but, entrusted as they are with the pecuniary concerns and general operations of the Society, justice to themselves and to their constituents requires, that they should not greatly extend the expenditures of the Society beyond its actual receipts.

One source of the pecuniary difficulties of the Society has been the purchase of the Anti-Slavery Depository—a purchase made on favorable terms, which was deemed indispensable to the welfare of our cause in this Commonwealth, and which, it is believed, will prove ultimately a source of profit rather than of loss. If the whole amount of books and pamphlets now in the Depository could be sold at cost, the Society would be wholly out of debt ; but as the stock on hand is very large, and the sales are comparatively slow, time and a wise economy will be required to balance accounts.

For further particulars respecting the Depository, and the receipts and expenditures of the Society during the past year, the members are referred to the Treasurer's Report.

The Treasurer of this Society, Henry G. Chapman, who has for several years past so generously and faithfully performed the duties of that responsible office, in consequence of extreme ill health, and by the advice of his physicians, left Boston in company with his wife for Hayti, on the 28th ultimo, where they intend to remain a few months, and from thence they may possibly go to Europe. The best wishes of the Board, and of a numerous throng of friends, go with them, for his speedy restoration to health, and for their safe return to the endearments of home, and the renewal of their labors in the glorious cause of liberty. It may be affirmed, without disparagement to any one, that the absence of Mrs. Chapman from the country is a more serious loss than could be that of any other abolitionist, or perhaps of many others. With a vision clear as the eagle's, a spirit superior to every trial, an intellect equal to any emergency, a soul as large as humanity,—and with great fertility of invention and power of execution, accompanied by a well-regulated zeal and a victorious trust in the invincibleness of truth and justice,—she has made herself seen and felt on both

sides of the Atlantic, and given a mighty impulse to the abolition movement, both at home and abroad. This is not the time nor the occasion to trace her career: to a future historian belongs the enviable task of writing her biography. Serene in the hour of peril, sagacious in detecting evil to our enterprise, clinging to principle at the sacrifice of all earthly considerations, ever planning and ever toiling to foil the machinations of the enemies of emancipation, and to usher in the day of jubilee, she has won for herself the respect, admiration, and gratitude of the faithful friends of the slave, wherever they are familiar with her worth and works. Her anti-slavery writings are among the best productions of the age, and abound with passages of great splendor, beauty and power. Should circumstances enable her to give a sketch of her residence in Hayti, the work would undoubtedly be one of great interest and value, and serve to render her temporary loss to us a source of less regret. The latest production from her pen is the Seventh Annual Report of the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society, which, besides being printed in pamphlet form, was published entire in the columns of the Anti-Slavery Standard and the Liberator. It is indeed a seasonable and spirit-stirring Report. It is in the following strain that she addresses her female coadjutors in the Society:

“ Let us prepare ourselves, beloved friends, to maintain our lofty and influential position to the last. Great is the influence granted to those who will use it for the good of mankind, nor seek themselves, or their own small interests, in any thing they do. Utter abnegation of self—this is the armor in which we may pass unheeding through the shafts of malignant misrepresentation, and opposition, and treachery; and still at every emergency may we be enabled by it to present ourselves as the devoted—marking, by our unheralded advance, the path the hosts behind us are to follow.”

“ We shall lose our *influence*, we are told, by the decisive and rapid movements that leave the fearful and the lukewarm in the rear. Influence! Is that uninfluencing weapon worthy the name, that rests in the scabbard in fear of its brightness? To respect every one's freedom of choice, we are bound: if others are hesitating and dilatory, we have only to suffer it to be so. But well is it for the cause, for us, to pass rapidly onward, breaking down the obstacles to their wavering advance.”

The following passage betokens that faith which is based upon the Eternal Rock, and over which earthly mutations possess no power:

“ How many a time have nations been saved by their *women*, when every other hope seemed extinct! And so may it be with America, if we will have it so. There is moral power enough in presence here to-day, to settle, affirmatively, the question we have raised. This is a sinful nation that has deeply *offended*; yet that law is an unvarying one of God's providence, by which he will save each of its populous cities for *ten*'s sake! And who is here so cold of soul, that would not be enrolled with joy in so noble a registry? ”

Here, too, is a passage full of eloquence and truth--a fine specimen of the moral sublime :

" Fearlessly and earnestly we say to such as forbid us to cast our whole souls, with all their energies, into this cause, and by whose unworthy opposition we might have been ' sore let and hindered,' had our love for it been less--gently and firmly we tell them that their opposition comes too late. It is necessary for the success of the anti-slavery enterprise, that the hands should be *free* that urge it onward. And the hands from which the fetters have fallen in the intensity of their exertions for the freedom of others, can never again be bound. Threatenings, and entreaties, and abuse, must be alike in vain, before a conscientious conviction of duty. The appeals of some *professed* abolitionists to the *magnanimity* of women are the most insulting to human nature of all. We do really think that we owe the cause our free service. We do really think that we can aid it more than such ; and, therefore, if they or ourselves are to " weep in secret places," we do really think the cause will lose least by *their* retreat. Had it been our personal rights or wrongs that impelled us,—had it been any thing but love of the cause of human rights,—we might have withdrawn from the association where we had so long acceptably labored, on the first intimation that our absence as co-laborers was desirable. Were it our own will we sought,

" We would not die in that man's company,
Who fears his fellowship to die with us."

The very pro-slavery community laughs at the men who would reject any aid at its demand, and suspects the sincerity of their pretended love for freedom. Of all the means of abolishing slavery, perhaps the most effectual is the irrepressible sympathy for the wronged and suffering, that swells high above the usages that would dam up its current—that signs petitions to the Legislature against old usages—that dwells in conversation upon the hitherto interdicted subject against old usages—which prays and labors for its extinction against old usages—which rejoices to present it for consideration to assembled multitudes against old usages !"

What satire can be more keen, or what rebuke more fairly bestowed, than is contained in the following extract ?

" But this short-lived opposition to the free labors of women will not long exist. It was not an honest one, but had its origin in the pretences of detected unfaithfulness. Men, so suddenly and so preposterously deferential to usages, will soon be silent on this head. They have submitted in silence to see " women on committees " in other enterprises ; and silently they are witnessing the general progress of the age. They feel no call to proscribe the " mixed commissions " that have erected the Bunker-Hill Monument. No burst of indignation against " woman usurping authority " follows the address of a gentleman to the presiding officer of a monument meeting at Worcester—" *Madam President !*"—no denunciations follow the appointment of ten men and ten women as the committee of a public meeting in Newburyport. Classical and revered Cambridge nominates a whole committee of women on a similar occasion, and pledges its manhood to execute their mandates, declaring its " reliance on their strong arm for success," unridiculed and unrebuted. Since men have proclaimed, with pride, how scarfs and handkerchiefs wave *applause* at whig and democratic gatherings, we feel no call to defend our interest in the anti-slavery cause from the charge of " singular and unwomanly participation in matters out of our sphere." Since

Bancroft, years ago, proclaimed what the democracy of Massachusetts sanctioned, that the principles of that party were applicable to woman—and since Webster has instructed the ladies of Virginia, that it is their duty to rectify the principles and keep alive the truth and honesty of the community,—we “experience no inclination” to contract our sphere of usefulness, on the ground that its present enlargement will shock the prejudices of the world.”

In giving a sketch of the rise and progress of the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society, the Report alludes to the violent opposition of the pro-slavery clergy, who, “when made aware that the Church obstinately sustained slavery, should have declared her no Church of Christ. But, in so doing, they would have acknowledged the guilty silence of their own past lives; and this they had not the hearts to do, for their hearts were not repentant. They strove, instead, to extinguish the spirit of freedom.”

The Report then proceeds to account for the sad apostacy from our ranks of many who had exhibited an undaunted front through the troubrous times of mobocracy :

“ By the fourth year, 1837, this course of so influential a body of men as the ministry, partially produced its intended effect, in the anti-slavery ranks. Spiritual wickedness in high places triumphed over the integrity and resolution of some who had undertaken the task of freeing the American slave. They had not anticipated the source from which the most formidable opposition was to come, and shrunk from the contest. The peltings of a mob they could bear. *Such* opposition does but strengthen the merely human powers of endurance. But the *spiritual* mob—the scourgings in the *synagoguc*—the being delivered up of men to their *councils*—this, being unexpected, was too hard to be borne. Their worldly reputation they had seemed more willing to lose, but they clung to their *Christian* character, though its preservation depended on the good word of those whose praise they ought to have felt as a reproach—who had put darkness for light, and slavery for freedom. The Church, pro-slavery as it had shown itself, was, in fact, *their world*; and they yielded up the interests of the slave to its demands. But the reproach they avoided on one side, they incurred on the other; and to excuse themselves for taking their final stand by the side of the pro-slavery friends, whose influence they had so long resisted, they became the accusers before the world of the faithful band they forsook—renounced its fellowship, and formed hostile societies for its destruction.”

In connection with this notice of the invaluable labors of Mrs. CHAPMAN, the Board would bestow their commendation upon the equally zealous efforts of AEBY KELLEY, of Millbury, in this Commonwealth, (a member of the Society of Friends,) who, for the last two years, has voluntarily stood forth as the public advocate of “the suffering and the dumb” in our land. With excellent qualifications for a lecturer, and a rare spirit of self-sacrifice, she has greatly served our cause, and done much to confound our woman-despising adversaries. The principal field of her labors has been

the State of Connecticut; and, as a proof of the power and utility of her lectures, the fact that she has produced more excitement among the pro-slavery "powers that be" in Church and State, than any other lecturer now before the public, is strong circumstantial evidence. The amount of courage, endurance, "faith, hope, charity," which is indispensable to sustain such an advocate, in the midst of a perverse and scoffing generation, scarcely admits of computation. She has had to encounter ridicule, obloquy, violence, in almost every shape, not only from the open despisers of our enterprise, but from some of its professed friends; yet has she not faltered in her career, but with calm serenity and noble fortitude, triumphed over all opposition. When those excellent women, the GRIMKES, adventured to address promiscuous assemblies, they were cheered on by the whole body of abolitionists; and if their career was, in some respects, one of trial and hazard, it was also accompanied by no small amount of eclat and popularity. They knew that they had the approbation of the great body of the friends of emancipation, from the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society down to the officers of the village association;—every anti-slavery press in the republic was eloquent in their praise;—they were overwhelmed with applications to lecture to the people. But how different has been the experience of the equally devoted, equally worthy KELLEY! Though not inferior to either of those gifted women in any of the qualifications requisite to constitute an effective public laborer, and having as strong claims to kind and respectful treatment, she has been denounced by some of the warmest admirers of the GRIMKES—scarcely an anti-slavery press has noticed her labors—and she has been compelled to meet an array of opposition, unknown to either of her female predecessors;—and all this because she is *a woman!* So inconsistent and treacherous has been the conduct of the seceders from the old platform!

At a meeting of the Millbury Female Anti-Slavery Society, held in September last, the following merited tribute to her worth was paid by those who are most intimately acquainted with her:

"Resolved, That we deeply sympathize with our esteemed friend and coadjutor, ABBY KELLEY, in the manifold trials she has to endure for the slave's sake; and, from personal acquaintance, would recommend her to those with whom she is called to labor as one of the ablest advocates of the slave."

The editor of the National Anti-Slavery Standard speaks of her labors in the following terms:

“ This extraordinary young woman is doing immense service in the anti-slavery field. To the modesty that becomes humanity—the humanity that adorns the Christian—the faithfulness, and the independence, and the freedom of spirit, that distinguish the true Christian, who fears God only of all the universe—she unites a power of intellect that is exceedingly rare, and an eloquence that nothing but flint can withstand, and flint cannot endure it. The pro-slavery pulpit of Connecticut has tried to silence her voice. It cannot succeed. She has no deference for that wooden eminence. The voice of God—the commands of Christ—the gospel of her Divine Master, she hearkens to more than the papistry of Connecticut, and goes forth triumphantly pleading the cause of her enslaved and perishing kindred.”

The Board deem it proper thus to notice Mrs. CHAPMAN and Miss KELLEY, not because they are, in fact, more deserving of praise than a multitude of other women who are engaged in the same great enterprise, but because they occupy a position of greater conspicuousness and responsibility, and, consequently, of greater exposure to the shafts of malice. Were it not for the superior benevolence, zeal and activity of the women, the anti-slavery cause would languish and expire. Though they may have none to trumpet their deeds and their alms in the ear of the world, yet they are known to Him who is no respecter of persons, and to that Saviour who bestowed the high panegyric upon the widow who cast her two mites into the treasury, “ SHE HATH DONE WHAT SHE COULD,”—and more God does not require, and man cannot perform. It is the testimony of that great advocate of universal freedom, DANIEL O’CONNELL, in relation to the women of England, who exerted themselves in the cause of West India emancipation—

“ The women of England have led the way; and under the banner of the maids and matrons of England, proud must that individual be who shall have an opportunity of telling them, “ At your command we have done our duty, and slavery is at an end!” Oh, blessings upon them!”

Again, in a letter to Lucretia Mott, of Philadelphia, he says:

“ The cause which is so intimately interwoven with every good feeling of humanity, and with the highest and most sacred principles of Christianity—the anti-slavery cause in America—is under the greatest, the deepest, the most heart-binding obligation to the females who have joined the anti-slavery societies in the United States. They have shown a passive, but permanent courage, which ought to put many of the male advocates to the blush. The American ladies have persevered in our holy cause, amidst difficulties and dangers, with the zeal of confessors, and the firmness of martyrs—and, therefore, emphatically they should not be disparaged or discouraged by any slight or contumely offered to their rights. In the great work in which we are now engaged, the women have the same duties, and should therefore enjoy the same rights with the men, in the performance of their duties.”

A call for a “National Anti-Slavery Convention for Independent

Nominations," having been made by a small meeting of abolitionists in Genessee county, New York, in February last, to be holden at Albany, on the 1st of April, the Board, in consequence of the silence maintained in reference to it by the Executive Committee of the parent society, issued an "Address to the Abolitionists of the United States," in which they strongly objected to the manner in which the Convention had been called, and to the design of it, namely, the organization of a third political party—a design which they proved, by numerous quotations from anti-slavery documents, to be contrary to the reiterated pledges of our organization. In the course of their argument, they said :

" The proposition for the formation of a distinct political party has been very fully and ably discussed in the anti-slavery periodicals during the past year, and overwhelmingly rejected by abolitionists throughout the country, as inexpedient, improper, and dangerous to the integrity and peace of our organization. The State Anti-Slavery Societies of Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut, have *unanimously* voted it down ; and a multitude of other societies, in various sections of the country, have coincided in this decision. No one has given it an approval, to our knowledge. The national anti-slavery convention, which assembled at Albany in August last, with special reference to the subject of political action, declined taking any definite position, in regard to a third party.

Notwithstanding these strong and gratifying expressions of sentiment, the *EMANCIPIATOR* (the official organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society) continues to advocate the formation of such a party ! This conduct, in our opinion, is exceedingly unwise and reprehensible. Nor can we but deeply regret the course pursued by the Executive Committee of the Parent Society ; inasmuch as they necessarily, by their silence, seem to countenance all that is advanced in the *Emancipator* on this subject ; and inasmuch as the society which they represent stands publicly pledged to " open no road to political preferment," and has constantly deprecated the formation of a distinct political party by abolitionists."

And they concluded their Address as follows :

" For the honor and purity of our enterprise, we trust that the abolitionists of the several States will refuse to give any countenance to the proposed convention at Albany. Let their verdict be recorded against it as unauthorized, unnecessary, premature. Let the meeting be insignificant and local, and thus rendered harmless. Whenever the exigencies of the times shall demand another national anti-slavery convention, let the call be made through an official medium : let the Executive Committee of the Parent Society, after having clearly ascertained the views of the managers of the several State societies in relation to it, send forth an invitation. Let us not sanction a precedent, which shall encourage, nay authorize a few, irresponsible individuals at any time to appoint a national gathering of abolitionists, as it may suit their caprice or ambition, in order to promote some selfish or local purposes. The annual meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society will be held in New York city early in May ; and at that meeting, (which will be the most important in its bearings upon the purity and success of our cause of any that has preceded it,) let there be an overwhelming attendance of

the tried and faithful friends of immediate emancipation, to deliberate and act not only upon the political, but upon every other aspect of our holy enterprise."

For presuming to issue this Address, the Board were assailed with great violence by the "Friend of Man" and the "Emancipator," but it had a salutary effect. The Convention was held, and proved to be a very local affair. Of 121 persons who enrolled their names on the occasion, 48 belonged to Albany! and 104 to the State of New York. There was 1 from Maine! 0 from New Hampshire! 2 from Vermont! 11 from Massachusetts! 0 from Rhode Island! 1 from Connecticut! 2 from New Jersey! 0 from Pennsylvania! 0 from Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan! Still, the handful of individuals thus brought together had the folly and infatuation to nominate JAMES G. BIRNEY and THOMAS EARLE, as candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States!! Small as the Convention was, it was almost equally divided in opinion; for the nomination was sustained by a majority of only *eleven* persons! Yeas 44—Nays 33! The Presidential election has since transpired, and the result proves that the great body of abolitionists are still opposed to any distinct political organization—the Birney and Earle ticket having received less than seven thousand votes out of some two millions and a half that were cast by the people of the United States. Nothing daunted, however, by this result, the friends of the third party movement, seem determined to persevere in their chimerical and injurious course. In New England, they are chiefly, though not exclusively, the adherents of the "new organization."

The late election was one of unprecedented excitement in this country—an excitement that swept away many strong abolitionists from their foundation, and caused them to violate their pledge, that they would not vote for the election of any slaveholder or upholder of slavery. They argued themselves into a belief that they would do no injury, but perhaps would indirectly give aid, to the anti-slavery cause, by voting for Martin Van Buren or William Henry Harrison—on the plea that "half a loaf is better than no bread." The Board would not impeach the purity of their motives, but they cannot but marvel at such delusion, and lament such an obvious departure from anti-slavery principles. They have the satisfaction to state, that, however inconsistently individuals may have acted, of all the anti-slavery journals in the land, not one of them countenanced, but all of them strenuously opposed the election of either Mr. Van Buren or General Harrison

The political course which the abolitionists marked out for themselves, from an early period, as safe, wise, and effective, is defined in the following extract from a circular to the American abolitionists, issued in July, 1837, by the individuals whose names are appended to it, appointed for that purpose by the Executive Committee of the National Society :

At the last annual meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, the following resolution was adopted :—

“ Resolved, That WE DEPRECATE THE ORGANIZATION OF ANY ABOLITION POLITICAL PARTY; but that we recommend to abolitionists throughout the country to interrogate candidates for office, with reference to their opinions on subjects connected with the abolition of slavery; and to vote, irrespective of party, for those only who will advocate the principles of universal liberty.”

Resolutions embodying the same idea have been passed by the New-England Anti-Slavery Convention; and, we believe, *by nearly all, if not all, the State Anti-Slavery Societies.*

The undersigned think the time has come, when the friends of the slave, throughout the Free States, *should act fully up to the LETTER and SPIRIT of those resolutions.* * * * *

All the resolutions above referred to, *deprecate the formation of a distinct anti-slavery political party.* We hope our friends in your region WILL DISCOUNTENANCE ANY SUCH ATTEMPT, or any effort to unite our interests with any existing party. Such a course would surely neutralize our influence, if it did not produce distraction and ruin. Our strength, yea, our invincibility will be found to consist, in first sacrificing our partisan predilections on the altar of humanity, and then holding ourselves entirely aloof from both the political parties. Our motto should be, “ *Form alliances with no political party, but enstamp our PRINCIPLES upon all.* ” Thus acting and thus rallying, *as one man*, to their support, we must be felt.

It is possible, that, in some cases, neither party will put in nomination men for whom you can consistently vote; for no *profession* of our principles ought to be regarded, when it is unattended with a good moral deportment. In that case, *abolitionists should either not vote at all, or scatter their votes as circumstances may render advisable.* Where a majority of all the votes is required to an election, the latter course may be found wise. In the language of one of the most distinguished statesmen of the country, “ *Such a party will assuredly cause itself to be respected.* ” By order of the Executive Committee.

JAMES G. BIRNEY,
E. WRIGHT, Jr. } Corresponding Secretaries.
HENRY B. STANTON,

The political success of abolitionism in this Commonwealth and in Vermont, demonstrates that, if abolitionists will continue to act independently of mere party considerations, and to aim at the possession of the BALANCE OF POWER between the existing parties, they may speedily control the legislation of every non-slaveholding state, in relation to their enterprize. At the last session of the Massachusetts Legislature, resolutions were adopted by both houses, (in the Senate by a small majority, in the House of Representatives by

¤ strong vote,) calling upon Congress "to exercise its acknowledged power in the IMMEDIATE suppression of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia"—to abolish, without delay, the domestic slave trade between the several States—to refuse admission into the Union of any new State whose constitution shall tolerate domestic slavery : and denouncing the congressional gag law, * (which was adopted by the U. S. House of Representatives a few days after the last annual meeting of this Society was held,) by which no anti-slavery petition was allowed to be received, " or entertained in any way whatever," as "a palpable violation of the Constitution of the U.S., a bold denial of inalienable rights, and a stretch of power which can never be quietly submitted to by a free people"—as "being void in its inception, and of no binding force upon the people or their representatives." Resolves have also been adopted by the House of Representatives of Vermont, calling for the immediate abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia, &c., &c. ; and a bill adopted by the Legislature, giving the right of trial by jury to every alleged fugitive from slavery, and by its provisions rendering it extremely difficult, if not impracticable, for any pursuer to recover his self-emancipated victim.

Such is the auspicious result of that political policy, which Messrs. Birney, Wright and Stanton enjoined in their Circular of 1837, upon the abolitionists of the United States !

The report of the legislative committee, recommending the repeal of that portion of the Marriage Law of this State, which degrades and punishes a portion of our fellow-citizens on account of their complexion, which is a virtual repeal of the command, " What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder," and which is the only proscriptive act against our colored population remaining in the civil code of this Commonwealth, was at first adopted, but finally rejected by a bare majority. It is confidently believed that, at the present session of the Legislature, the repeal will be made, and, we hope, without any serious opposition. †

As far as could be ascertained, the whole number of petitioners, at the last session, in relation to the admission of Florida into the Union as a slave State, was, males, 4,386—females, 8,153—total 12,484. Relating to the repeal of the marriage law, males, 2096—

* See Appendix.

† For the Reports and Resolves of the various Committees, and a sketch of the Debates upon them, vide the Liberator of March 27, April 17, and May 1.

females, 5534—total, 7630. Relating to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, males, 6,182—females, 10,643—total 16,835. Relating to the gag-law of Congress, males, 1917—females, 145—total, 2052.

The Massachusetts Abolition Society asserted, through its Executive Committee and official organ, that the State Anti-Slavery Society had “lost the staff of accomplishment.” Previous to the last session of the Legislature, each Society sent different forms of petitions, so that we are are able to determine who really holds and uses that staff. The result was, that of 39,056 names which were appended to *all* the petitions, 37,329 appeared to have been obtained by the friends of the old organization, and 1,727 by those of the new!

The thanks of the friends of equal rights are specially due to the Hon. GEORGE T. DAVIS, of the Senate, and Chairman of the Joint Committee, and GEORGE BRADEBURN, Esq. of the House of Representatives, for the fearless, zealous and eloquent manner in which they vindicated the great and eternal principles of justice and humanity. Their vigilance was sleepless, their ardor invincible, their success (with a single exception) triumphant. In the legislative history of this Commonwealth, their names will be long and honorably remembered.

In the Senate of Massachusetts, on the 5th of March, the following order, or motion, of Hon. Mr. CHOATE, of Essex, was universally adopted :

Ordered, That the Committee on the subject of Slavery be instructed to consider and report upon the expediency of requesting our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to use their influence in procuring the passage of a law, authorizing the National Executive to appoint agents in all the seaports, where Custom Houses are established, in States tolerating the institution of domestic slavery, whose duty it shall be to protect and enforce the rights of such persons claiming to be citizens of other States, as may be held in slavery, or be imprisoned on suspicion of being slaves, the expense of such agencies to be defrayed by the Treasury of the United States.

Owing to the want of time, no further action was taken upon the subject by the Legislature; but the suggestion contained in the order was highly important, and it is to be hoped will be adopted at the present session as absolutely essential to the personal safety and liberty of the colored citizens of this commonwealth.

The Resolves adopted by the Legislature, concerning the denial by Congress of the right of petition, and relating to slavery and the slave trade, and the admission of new States into the Union, were

returned to that body by Gov. Morton *without his signature*, on the ground that they did not, in his opinion, fall within his province of revision, &c. &c. * This was a very remarkable procedure and excited much surprise and sensation throughout the Commonwealth. The message was referred to a special Committee, who, in a brief Report, placed Gov. Morton in a very absurd position.

A short time prior to the last annual meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, an editorial article appeared in the *Pennsylvania Freeman*, from the pen of its editor, JOHN G. WHITTIER, in which the extraordinary proposition was made that the Society should be dissolved, and that a "*Central Committee*" of tried and competent men, "representing no society or association, but simply acting *on their own responsibility*, with such means as the confidence of the public might entrust them with," should be substituted for it! The reason given for such a procedure was, that "the great object for which the machinery of our organization was created is measurably lost: it fails to secure the grand desideratum—**A CONCERT OF ACTION.**" And it was added—"Such a Committee would be very similar to that of our English friends in London." A recommendation like this, coming from such a quarter, excited the astonishment of thousands, who were forced to exclaim, in view of it, "*Et tu, Brute?*" Attempts had been previously made, by disaffected individuals, to put the management of our organization into other hands; but not one of them had dared to venture so far as to propose the abandonment of the Anti-Slavery Society. This was reserved for one whose name is appended to the **DECLARATION OF SENTIMENTS**, who assisted at the formation of the Parent Society, and who has won for himself much respect for his efforts in our sacred cause!

The proposition was eagerly endorsed by the editor of the *Cincinnati Philanthropist*, as follows:

"Suppose then, that at the next anniversary, *the national society quietly dissolve itself.*(!) The Executive Committee will then be untrammeled.(!) They can act where and when they please. As their resources will depend upon the amount of confidence reposed in them by the anti-slavery community, they will be bound by the strongest motives to act with discretion, and in uncompromising accordance with the true standard of abolitionism. Their responsibility in this matter, (having no national organization to back them,) will keep them faithful. They would in fact constitute such a Committee as the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions."

The idea that the Executive Committee, who had in some things proved themselves unfaithful to their trust as the representatives of the national organization, would be more faithful without than with

* See Appendix.

such an organization, was a virtual proclamation that THE PEOPLE could not be so safely trusted with their own concerns as a self-elected body of directors! It was so opposed to the genius of our free movement, and so offensive to the genuine anti-slavery spirit of the land, that it found scarcely a single advocate.

In April, the Rev. DAVID Root, (an agent of the Massachusetts Abolition Society,) in a communication published in the *Emancipator*, proposed the dissolution of the National Society and all its State auxiliaries, and the substitution of an "American Board of Commissioners (!) for the abolition of slavery, to be independent, possessing powers similar to those of the A. B. C. F. M."—the Board to "appoint State committees in each State, or a subordinate Board in each State, who should be a committee or Board of advice and reference, and should be auxiliary to the Parent Board."

Mr. Root's arguments for such an organization were, that *the old one would not answer!* "It has not the confidence of the Christian [pro-slavery] public so extensively as it ought to have, nor has it fully our own confidence. It is *essentially defective*, too complicated, inadequate to the accomplishment of the mighty object we have in view, and fraught with confusion"!! The new organization "would give an *honorable* and deserved character to our enterprise"—&c. &c. Nothing was said against this project by the *Emancipator*, and it is under such circumstances that "silence gives consent."

In the *Emancipator* of the same month, another individual, (evidently a member of the Executive Committee,) claiming to be "one of the early friends of the anti-slavery cause, and for nearly six years intimately connected with the transactions of the American Society," proclaimed it as "demonstrated that the Society was no longer necessary in the prosecution of our object,—indeed, that it was rather a hindrance than an aid!"

"It now seems clear that the Anti-Slavery Organization has effected all that an organization could effect in such a cause—and that its continuance is no longer necessary.

Some who have never suffered such a thought as the dissolution of the Society to enter their minds, may be alarmed at first hearing the proposition, and be ready to conclude that if the society be dissolved, the whole anti-slavery movement will come to nought. It is not denied, that there is danger that the movement may come to nought. But, as I view it, the danger is decidedly greater *with* the Society as it now is, or promises hereafter to be—than *without* it. If the anti-slavery cause should require a new structure of any kind to sustain it, circumstances will soon point out how it ought to be built. Certain it is, that another society will never be called for.

Believing then that the American Anti-Slavery Society is no longer necessary for the advancement of the anti-slavery cause—but rather

(owing to our dissensions) a hindrance, bringing the whole anti-slavery movement into disrepute,—it is proposed for your serious consideration, whether THE SOCIETY OUGHT NOT TO BE FORMALLY DISSOLVED.”

In the same paper, a report of a Special Committee to the Executive Committee of the Parent Society, signed by JAMES G. BIRNEY and LEWIS TAFFAN, (JAMES S. GIBBONS dissenting from the report,) was published, which concluded as follows:

“We therefore advise that the Executive Committee recommend to the American Society, at its next annual meeting, either formally to resume their whole power as to *auxiliary societies*—as to *territory, funds, &c. &c.* or formally to dissolve the American Society, as being no longer necessary.”

Various amendments to the Constitution of the American Society were also proposed by individuals, the design of which was not only to exclude women, but even the great body of the members of the Society from the business meetings! So that the power might be in the hands of the few, not of the many—of a select class, and not of “the common people!” The following was proposed by the Rev. CHARLES T. TORREY:

ARTICLE . The business of the Society, at its annual meeting, shall be transacted by its officers, and a delegation of as many persons from each State auxiliary as the State has representatives in the Congress of the United States. Provided, that in those States where more than one State Society exists, the delegation shall be divided equally between the societies, if possible. If not, the society having the largest number of auxiliaries shall have the greater number of delegates. The business sessions of the society shall not be considered public meetings, unless by a special vote of the society; but all its matured action shall be made known, through the press, to whom it may concern.

The Rev. E. R. TYLER, formerly an agent of the American A. S. Society, but now the editor of the *Connecticut Observer*, in an editorial article published in his paper in April, recommending the “dissolution of the Parent Society, and re-organizing in a new and unexceptionable form,” said—

“We begin, though late, to suspect, that Dr. Channing was correct, in the remark which he early made, to this effect, that the anti-slavery societies ought to restrict the right of membership to MEN, of tried character and prudence, according to the plan of the anti-slavery societies in the times of Jay, Franklin, Rush, and Edwards.

What in fact is needed for the successful prosecution of this work but a central committee in New York, with sub-committees in the country, who shall see to the collection of funds, to the publication and distribution of books and papers, and to the public discussion of the subject? Nothing. But if any thing more is needed, in the opinion of others, in the way of organization, let the different denominations of Christians *act separately and independently.*”

Thus “coming events cast their shadows before.” These propo-

sals to take the life of the Society, or to commit its management to the exclusive control of a small delegated body, plainly evinced that the Executive Committee felt that their course would not meet the approval of the approaching annual meeting: hence their willingness to countenance the dissolution of the Society, if, peradventure, it might save them from a vote of censure.

Forewarned by these startling developments, and knowing, moreover, that a mighty effort would again be made to prevent the free action of *all* the members of the Parent Society, an address was published to the abolitionists of the United States by the Board of Managers of the State A. S. Society, in which, after stating what was to be apprehended at the annual meeting, they said—

“In whatever part of the country you reside, we call upon you to rally at that meeting as one man, by all the sacrifices which you have made, and all the perils through which you have passed—by your abhorrence of bigotry and intolerance on the one hand, and of political ambition and profligacy on the other—by the hopes which have been raised in the bosoms of the friends of freedom on both sides of the Atlantic, and of those who are pining in bondage on our own shores, in view of our national anti-slavery organization—by your faith in **HIM** who has chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty! Our cause is in peril among false brethren; and upon the result of the meeting in New York, great events will depend. They who are for placing it in other hands, or, in case they cannot succeed, are for annihilating the National Society in the expectation of disbanding every other, will spare no pains to muster as strong an array as possible, on that occasion. Will the true-hearted men and women, whose love for the anti-slavery cause has thus far surmounted every obstacle, and outlived all persecution, and whose purpose it is to stand by the old platform, come what may, be less prompt or numerous in their attendance? Never has there been a crisis like the present, and it must be met with unfaltering spirit and invincible courage.

* * * * *

We call upon you, brethren, to frown indignantly upon each and every attempt thus to dissolve our noble organization into its original elements for the purpose of obstructing the growth of spiritual freedom and human progress—of gratifying personal envy or ambition—of fostering the great and relentless enemy of humanity, **SECTARISM**. If you would not see our broad platform in any degree narrowed—if you would preserve it from the spirit which is seeking to dash it in fragments—if you would still rally under an anti-sectarian banner, and unite with the wise and good of every name for the salvation of your country, and the deliverance of the oppressed—then you will throng to the anniversary of the Parent Society on the 12th of May next, in despite of hard times, from all parts of the country, in such numbers as to put down all machinations for the dissolution of an organization, which is the terror of the oppressor and bigot alike, and upon the existence of which depends, under God, in all probability, the peaceful abolition of slavery in the republic.”

This appeal of the Board was not made in vain. It was now ap-

parent that there would be a momentous struggle at the annual meeting; and unusual efforts were consequently made on all sides to secure a full attendance of delegates. The Executive Committee of the State Abolition Society issued a *private* circular, which was extensively circulated in New England, in which the most slanderous charges were preferred against those who were determined to save the American Society from destruction, and the most urgent solicitations were made to the individuals, to whom it was sent, to be present at the meeting, to put down those who were seeking to have "the energies and influence of the Society turned to the support of non-resistance and its kindred absurdities"!! Circulars of a similar character, designed to stir up the prejudices of abolitionists, and thus to make *a false issue*, were privately circulated at New York, and in various parts of the country.

In the mean time, the astounding information was received that the Executive Committee at New York were negotiating for the transfer of the *Emancipator* into foreign hands, on the ground that the funds of the Society were exhausted, but in reality, as it appeared in the sequel, to prevent the Society from having an organ, in case they should not be sustained at the annual meeting! At a quarterly meeting, therefore, of the Massachusetts A. S. Society, held in Boston on the 8th of April, the following resolutions, in relation to this extraordinary affair, were unanimously adopted :

Resolved, That we have learned with deep regret, coupled with indignation, that the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society are about to transfer the *Emancipator*, the organ of that Society, into the hands of a private individual.

Resolved, That such a transfer, at the present crisis in our cause, can be regarded in no other light than as part and parcel of a scheme for the destruction of the present American Anti-Slavery Society, and the erection, upon its ruins, of a *new national organization*, less catholic in spirit and principle; and that, in our opinion, it will meet with the decided condemnation of the Society at its annual meeting.

At a meeting of the New York Executive Committee, held on the 16th of the same month, the following preamble and resolution, consummating the transfer, were adopted :

"Whereas, The financial condition of the Society does not permit the continuance of the *Emancipator* in the hands of the Committee, or to reimburse subscribers who have paid in advance: and as it is desirable that the paper should be continued in this city;

Resolved that the Publishing Agent be authorized to sell the subscription books of the *Emancipator* to the Executive Committee of the New York City Anti-Slavery Society, including the arrears due from subscribers, provided they will supply those who have paid in advance, amounting to about \$1000—and will publish the paper, at least a year, under the charge of the present editor."

Against this unrighteous transaction, a Protest was entered by JAMES S. GIBBONS, a member of the Committee, who, like Abdiel, was "faithful among the faithless found." It was clearly proved in the Protest, that the plea of the Committee was utterly groundless. (1)

The most intense interest was now felt in all parts of the country, by friends and foes alike, in the result of the annual meeting. At the time appointed, the delegates assembled in great numbers in the Fourth Free Church; Francis Jackson, one of the Vice Presidents, in the chair. The chairman having named ABBY KELLEY as one of the business committee, the vote on her appointment stood, Yeas 557—Nays 451. This was the test question.

A request was then made by LEWIS TAPPAN, for the minority to meet in the basement of the meeting-house in the afternoon, to consider the expediency of forming an "American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society"! This was earnestly repeated by C. W. DENISON * in the afternoon. And so, for *no other* CRIME than that of permitting all its members to participate in its proceedings, the American Anti-Slavery Society was rent asunder, and a rival society organized, by some of the very men, too, who had justified the course pursued by the GRIMKES, and vindicated the right of women to equal action in the anti-slavery cause! The members of the old Executive Committee were elected officers of the new society; although their official organ, the *Emancipator*, one year previous, in commenting upon a similar act of the American Society, refusing to exclude female delegates, expressly said—

"The vote of the Society, being grounded on the phraseology of the Constitution, *cannot be justly regarded as committing the Society for or against any party on the general question of women's rights*; whereas, *a contrary decision, unsupported by the constitution, would have been taking sides on a question, respecting which THE SOCIETY WAS BOUND TO ENTIRE NEUTRALITY.*"

It must be left to the candid and dispassionate friends of emancipation, on both sides of the Atlantic, to decide, whether the Committee do not stand condemned out of their own mouths, and whether they are not inexcusable for their schismatical conduct.

How this division was regarded by the pro-slavery presses, and

(1) See the Protest in the Appendix.

* On the motion, respecting the right of ABBY KELLEY to act in the meeting, Mr. DENISON somewhat loudly called upon the women present to vote on his side of the question—in other words, to vote themselves out of the meeting !!

on which side their approving voice was heard, the following extracts will show.

The following paragraph is from the New York Journal of Commerce, a paper which has always warmly espoused the Colonization Society, and bitterly opposed the anti-slavery movement :

“ Be it known to all horned cattle, that the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, including its worthy President, Arthur Tappan, Esq. are regarded by the Garrison faction as far,—very far behind the age. They are not up to the latest humbugs by a long way. They do not hold to the non-resistance, no-human government theories ; they do not denounce the clergy ; they are not in favor of dressing out women with boots and spurs ; they can't go Perfectionism ; they regard the Sabbath as a Divine institution ; and in various other respects they are guilty of the most alarming heresies. Therefore they must be ousted from their places ; and to this end Garrison and his party are coming on, or have come on, with all the strength they could muster,—male and female, black and white,—to vote these gentlemen out of office.”

The Washington Globe, which is ferocious in its hostility to every thing in the shape of genuine abolitionism, shows its sympathy with the seceding party as follows :

“ The abolitionists have recently separated into two societies. In carrying out their principles, a portion of this sect came to the conclusion, that all human government is sinful, and that the woman should, in all respects, be considered as the equal of the man, instead of being his “ help-meet,” as made by their Creator. These ultras had a majority in the late anti-slavery Convention at New York, and permitted women to vote, and be appointed on committees. The consequence was, the secession of the minority, who did not relish this “ petticoat government,” and the formation of a new society, styling itself “ The American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.”

The New York Herald, of infamous notoriety, and especially distinguished for its pro-slavery virulence, complimented the seceders as men who had a true sense of “ self-respect,” and added—

“ Garrison and his coadjutors, anxious only for notoriety, and reckless of the means of obtaining it, have stimulated the more inconsiderate of their followers to ultra and odious measures, in the hope of driving off all sober men of discretion, (!) and thus gaining undisputed control of the means and influence of the society.”

In the same strain of falsehood and ridicule, the *Massachusetts Abolitionist* said—

“ The deed is done. The American Anti-Slavery Society is no longer what it was: its original character and design are gone. It is no longer conducted on its original principles, nor does it any longer seek merely its original objects. It has ceased to be an AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY Society, and has become a *Woman's Rights, Non-Government Anti-Slavery Society.* * * * Such were the materials, and such the method taken to revolutionize the American Anti-Slavery Society, and make it subservient to the vagaries and dogmas of women's rights and non-governmentism. We covet not the honor, nor the spoils of a victory thus won !”

That the malevolent enemies of the anti-slavery cause should attempt to make the National Society odious and ridiculous, by wicked and monstrous accusations, is not surprising ; but that any of the professed friends of the cause should unite with them in this work of mischief is truly lamentable.

In an address of the Executive Committee of the new American Society, which is replete with misrepresentation, in attempting to justify the secession, they declare—

“ It was believed (!) that the act of placing a woman on the business committee, was merely an initiatory step to the introduction of other measures, FOREIGN to the original principles and designs of the anti-slavery enterprise, all tending to divert the minds of abolitionists from the cause of the poor slave, and the rights of the free people of color.”

Here no overt act is charged, excepting that of “ placing a woman on a business committee ;” but the Society is disorganized on the ridiculous pretence that “ it was *believed*” that something foreign to our cause would next be attempted ! Is there any thing of anti-slavery honesty, charity, or magnanimity, in all this ? Is the American Anti-Slavery Society to be put down upon mere *suspicion* ? Now that Committee well know, that neither that society, nor any other in the land, *excepting the new organization*, has ever meddled with the question of woman’s sphere, or the rightfulness of governments ! They are challenged to produce an instance to the contrary. It is deplorable to witness the name of so excellent a man as ARTHUR TAPPAN appended to an address which is unsound in its reasoning, libellous in its charges, and full of misrepresentations. A most powerful reply has been made to that address by the present Executive Committee of the Parent Society, which has never been answered in any quarter, for the simple reason that it is unanswerable.

Thus, for adhering in simplicity of purpose and fidelity of spirit to the grand object of its existence, viz. the overthrow of slavery, the American Society found itself betrayed and abandoned by some of its most influential supporters, its character traduced, its resources greatly diminished, its organ and depository unjustifiably and dishonorably sold out of its hands, and its life sought by a new and hostile association ! Relying upon God and his truth to sustain it, and upon the perfect rectitude of its whole course, the humble body of men and women who still clung to it, went forward in the prosecution of the business of the Society with serene countenances and fearless hearts. They chose a new executive commit-

tee, if less conspicuous in the eyes of the world than the old, certainly not less trustworthy and devoted to the cause,—and resolved to persevere to the end of the holy conflict with slavery. By that committee, a large and beautifully printed sheet was almost immediately flung out to the breeze, as the organ of the Society, bearing the significant title of the "NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD," and the expressive motto, "WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE." Around that "STANDARD," should all true-hearted abolitionists rally, and pledge themselves that it shall not be struck until every yoke is broken, every slave set free! Under the editorial care of NATHANIEL P. ROGERS, it is truly "a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well."

In the month of November last, the Board made a pledge of two thousand dollars to the Parent Society for the current year, to sustain its operations; though it was hoped that a much larger sum would be raised for this purpose in the Commonwealth. More than one half of the pledge has been redeemed,—five hundred dollars having been generously contributed by the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society. It is highly desirable that the Board should be enabled promptly to redeem the remainder of the pledge. The friends of the old anti-slavery platform, in all parts of the Union, should anticipate, by their liberal donations, all the wants of the American Society. The utmost confidence may be placed in the wisdom, integrity, economy and financial accuracy of its Executive Committee.

The Seventh Annual Meeting of the New England Anti-Slavery Convention was held in Boston on the 26th of May last. Not less than four hundred persons enrolled their names as members. It gave a fresh impetus to the anti-slavery movement, and greatly strengthened all who participated in its proceedings. Among other important resolutions, the following was **UNANIMOUSLY** adopted :

"Whereas, The American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, in an "Address to the Friends of the Anti-Slavery cause throughout the U. States and the World," has either expressly or by insinuation accused those, or some of those, who remain connected with the American Anti-Slavery Society, of having "identified" the latter Society with "the *private* opinions of individuals, as to the *inherent sinfulness* of human government, and the sphere in which females ought to act," or obtained "its official sanction to principles evidently foreign to any thing contemplated, or set forth in its Constitution;" and of designing to introduce "measures FOREIGN to the original principles and designs of the anti-slavery enterprise, tending to divert the minds of abolitionists from the cause of the slave, and the rights of the free people of color;" and has declared that "the same persons belonging to the anti-slavery ranks,

who are contending for what they call "women's rights"—the civil and political equality of women with men—deny the obligation of forming, supporting, or yielding obedience to civil government, and refuse to affirm the duty of political action ;" that "they contrived to bring to the late annual meeting of the Society a sufficient number of men and *women* to compose a majority of all the members present, to sustain their views and measures"—that "of the whole number present this year, *four hundred and sixty-four* were from the single State of Massachusetts!" and "styling themselves 'non-resistants,' they seemed determined to carry forward their favorite theories and practices, at all events, even if the great moral enterprise in which they and we originally embarked, should retrograde ;" therefore,

Resolved, That we feel constrained to express our astonishment at the publication, from such a source, of statements and insinuations *so grossly untrue, and unworthy the character of honorable men*, engaged in an enterprise of philanthropy, as the above and others contained in the same document, and to record against them OUR EXPRESS AND EMPHATIC DENIAL."

The facts in relation to the "World's Convention" are too well known by the abolitionists of the United States to need recapitulation in the present report. Though such a Convention was called, no such Convention was held. The Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society declared the meeting to be a mere "Conference" with themselves, and in fact prescribed its rules and regulations. They assumed the unauthorised power to make themselves members of the body in their official capacity, but would not allow the meeting to sit with open doors, or all who were delegates to be enrolled as members! The American, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania Societies chose as their representatives, among others, certain women of great moral worth, intelligence, and philanthropy ; but these were scornfully shut out from the Convention on account of their sex! Tell it not in Turkey, publish it not in Hindostan ! They had, by virtue of their credentials, the same right as *delegates* to a seat in that assembly, as those who refused to grant them admittance ; and in their rejection, an insult was given to the great body of American abolitionists, and a stain cast upon the character of the Convention that time can never efface. Their right was eloquently sustained by Wendell Phillips, Prof. Adam, George Bradburn, Dr. Bowring, Col. Miller, Mr. Ashurst, and others. So contemptuous, however, was the spirit that prevailed in the Convention, that, when it was decided,—as it was by a large majority,—that the female delegates should be excluded, *a storm of applause followed*, as though a mighty victory had been obtained over slavery itself! In the course of some remarks, Mr. Birney stated, that "most of those who were for the rights of women in the United States, were also in favor of what

was called the no-human government system"!! It is inconceivable how a statement like this, *so utterly at variance with truth*, could pass from the lips of one claiming to be a man of honor and veracity. Of those in the anti-slavery ranks who are in favor of the equal action of women for the promotion of our enterprise, it may be safely affirmed, that scarcely *one in one hundred* is "in favor of what is called the no-human government system"! Mr. Birney owes it to himself, to the Convention, and to the world, to retract his groundless, yet most pernicious assertion—an assertion which, when made, elicited loud cries of "hear! hear! hear!" in all parts of the hall, and doubtless controlled the action of the meeting. Nearly all who opposed the reception of the female delegates were clergymen, not of the Church of England, but of other denominations.

Messrs. Garrison, Rogers, Remond and Adams, delegates to the Convention, did not arrive in season to participate in the discussion. On ascertaining, however, what that body had done, they very properly refused to become members of it, and accordingly took their seats in the gallery. They felt that, by the rejection of any one of the delegates, the whole body of abolitionists, whose credentials they bore, were equally rejected; and, therefore, as they could not obtain a hearing in the Convention, they chose "the post of honor," and of duty, "a private station." The exclusion of those honorable women drew forth exceedingly eloquent and important letters from DANIEL O'CONNELL, the champion of universal emancipation, and WILLIAM HOWITT, in which their rights were ably vindicated, and a just rebuke given to the narrow spirit that had led to their rejection. (1) In a letter recently received by Mr. GARRISON from Dr. JOHN BOWRING, that distinguished poet, civilian and philanthropist nobly says—

"How often have I regretted that the woman's question—to me of singular interest—was launched with so little combination—so little preparation—so little knowledge of the manner in which it had been entangled by the fears of some, and the follies of others! But, bear up!—for *the coming of those women will form an era in the future history of philanthropic daring*. They made a *deep*, if not a wide impression—and have created apostles, if as yet they have not multitudes of followers. *The experiment was well worth making*. IT HONORED AMERICA—IT WILL INSTRUCT ENGLAND. If, in some matters of high civilization, you are *behind*—in this matter of courageous benevolence, how far are you *before us*!"

(1) See Appendix.

One of the happy effects of Mr. GARRISON's visit to England was, soon after his arrival home, the receipt of a Letter from the venerable THOMAS CLARKSON, (1) announcing the important and gratifying fact, that he is now convinced of the pernicious character and evil tendency of the American Colonization Society, and therefore wishes to record his testimony against it. He states very minutely, and with great simplicity, how he was imposed upon by the specious, but truthless statements of ELLIOT CRESSON, formerly the agent of that Society in England—statements, which prove that that agent did not scruple to deal liberally in fiction and imposture during his residence abroad, in order to effect the unnatural object of his mission.

The letter is a very long one, and in Mr. CLARKSON's own handwriting. This aged philanthropist does not seem to be aware of the present existence of the Colonization Society; but he says if it does exist, it is both "criminal" and "delusive." After stating in what manner he had been deceived by Mr. Cresson, he adds— "It is unnecessary for me to attempt to describe what my feelings were upon this occasion. I will only say that I saw the scheme—shall I say, *the diabolical scheme?*—with new eyes, and that the new light thus thrown upon it, added to the two arguments before mentioned, *determined me to wash my hands clean for ever of the undertaking.*"

This letter will cause a thrill of joy in the hearts of the colored population of this country. Long have they mourned that their early and faithful friend CLARKSON has been so long kept in ignorance as to the principles, designs and operations of the Colonization Society, which they have constantly regarded with fear and abhorrence since its formation; and they have been apprehensive that he would go down to the grave unenlightened on this subject, and thus his powerful sanction be used by that Society to crush and expatriate the very people for whom he had toiled so long and suffered so much! But now they will rejoice in spirit; and in their rejoicing, all who truly espouse their cause in the United States will gladly unite. In the Protest against the Colonization Society, signed in 1833, by the illustrious WILBERFORCE and some of the most influential abolitionists in Great Britain, that Society was declared "to be an obstruction to the progress of liberty throughout the world."

(1) See Appendix.

The Board would express the deep interest which they feel in the success of the British India Society, which aims to give a death-blow to slavery and the slave trade throughout the world, by rescuing from their galling oppression the millions of down-trodden natives of that ill-fated country, and thus cultivating cotton by free labor, to the exclusion from the English and European markets of the slave grown cotton raised in the United States. GEORGE THOMPSON is the active and powerful advocate of that Society, and, assisted by the eloquent O'CONNELL, is making a deep impression upon the public mind. The Board deem it extremely fortunate that the services of Prof. WILLIAM ADAM, formerly connected with Harvard University, have been secured by that Society, by his acceptance of the office of Secretary. His accurate knowledge of the state of India, his many virtues and accomplishments, and his enlarged philanthropy, all concur to render him a most valuable co-adjutor in the great India movement.

During Christmas week, a Fair was held in Boston by the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society, for the benefit of the cause. The proceeds amounted to the liberal sum of TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS. Thanks to the tireless industry and generous devotedness of the anti-slavery women of the Commonwealth, for so encouraging a result! At the close of the Fair, a soiree was held in the hall of the Marlboro' Chapel, by the friends of emancipation. Not less than three hundred persons sat down, without distinction of rank, sex, or color, to an excellent entertainment; and a more delightful spectacle, or a more gratifying occasion, has not been witnessed since the commencement of our great enterprise. It was pronounced by the chairman to be the first "World's Convention" held since the apostacy in Eden. Among the individuals who addressed the company, in spirited and appropriate speeches, were Ellis Gray Loring, Samuel J. May, George Bradburn, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Joshua V. Himes, and Cyrus Pierce.

Of the other numerous and important events that have transpired, both at home and abroad, since the last annual meeting, the anti-slavery historian is referred to the anti-slavery periodicals of the day. It would be difficult even to recapitulate them, without swelling the present Report to the size of a volume.

In conclusion, the Board would urge the friends of bleeding humanity to go onward in the strength of God, turning neither to the right hand nor to the left, clinging to duty more closely than to life, and extending their operations for the downfall of slavery.

Their object is definite, grand, glorious—their principles are true and unconquerable—and they have only to persevere a little longer, in faith and hope, and the voices of emancipated millions of their countrymen will be heard thundering heavenward, “ Slavery is ended—is ended ! and we are free for ever ! Alleluiah ! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth !”

“ Blow ye the trumpet abroad o'er the sea,
Jehovah has triumphed, the bondman is free !
Sing—for the pride of the tyrant is broken,
His scourges and fetters, all clotted with blood,
Are wrenched from his grasp ;—for the word was but spoken,
And fetters and scourges were sunk in the flood !
Blow ye the trumpet abroad o'er the sea,
Jehovah has triumphed, the bondman is free !”

NOTE.

In the haste with which this Report has been printed, several typographical and other errors have escaped notice, which the reader will please to correct with his pen.

FINANCIAL.

Receipts into the Treasury, from Jan. 22d, 1840, to Jan. 23, 1841, mostly from Donations, including a balance of \$26 from old account,	\$7,432,29
From proceeds of Ladies' Fair,	2,000,97
	<hr/>
Total receipts,	9,433,26
Disbursements during same period, as follows, viz :	
Paid Agent's salaries and travelling expenses,	\$1,975,96
Paid over to J. A. Collins, General Agent, for liquidation of Agents' accounts, and payment of notes given for books,	3,966,24
Paid American A. S. So. to redeem our pledge,	1,197,50
Paid for Publications, Printing and Binding,	800,66
Paid expenses of Ladies' Fair,	330,12
Paid for use of Halls,	121,00
Paid advertising,	29,75
Paid Hiram Wilson amt. of donation received for him	20,00
Paid Office rent one quarter, and Furniture,	106,89
Paid for books, mostly "Despotism in America,"	180,01
Paid to order of President Boston Female A.S. So. from proceeds of Boston table at Fair,	100,00
Paid Treasurer of Abolition So., by order of Board, amt. of collection from Hatfield,	86,00
Paid balance of old debt to J. Winslow,	85,00
Paid policy of insurance against fire on 2500,00 dollars towards aint. of books in Depository,	15,62
Paid miscellaneous expenses,	25,23
	<hr/>
Total amt. of payments,	\$8,949,98
Leaving balance in Treasury, Jan. 23, 1841,	\$483,28
S. PHILBRICK, Treasurer, pro tem.	

Boston, Jan. 25, 1841.

I have examined the foregoing account of Samuel Philbrick, Treasurer pro tem. of the Mass. A. S. Society, and find the same duly vouch'd and properly cast, and that there is a balance in his hands due to the Society of four hundred and eighty-three dollars and twenty-eight cents.

S. E. SEWALL, Auditor.

Payments to Agents, by Treasurer.

1840.								
Jan'y 22.	P. C. Pettibone	-	-	-	-	\$11	35	
23.	Sumner Lincoln	-	-	-	-	8	53	
"	E. C. Smith	-	-	-	-	30	00	
"	P. R. Russell	-	-	-	-	10	00	
"	J. Sayles Brown	-	-	-	-	50	00	
"	J. A. Collins	-	-	-	-	430	15	
24.	J. C. Jackson	-	-	-	-	165	00	
"	N. H. Whiting	-	-	-	-	50	00	
"	J. C. Jackson	-	-	-	-	11	00	
"	George Foster	-	-	-	-	65	72	
"	Richard Hood	-	-	-	-	29	00	
28.	J. A. Collins	-	-	-	-	6	02	
Feb.	1.	T. P. Ryder	-	-	-	-	7	95
	11.	do.	do.	-	-	25	00	
	14.	E. C. Smith	-	-	-	-	34	49
	15.	J. A. Collins	-	-	-	-	258	23
	19.	W. L. Garrison	-	-	-	-	50	00
	24.	J. A. Collins	-	-	-	-	285	06
March	3.	do.	do.	-	-	-	300	00
	5.	do.	do.	-	-	-	16	60
	7.	do.	do.	-	-	-	27	63
	16.	do.	do.	-	-	-	37	47
	30.	do.	do.	-	-	-	28	65
	31.	George Foster	-	-	-	-	100	50
April	3.	W. L. Garrison	-	-	-	-	80	75
	6.	John Jones	-	-	-	-	51	74
"	J. A. Collins	-	-	-	-	-	50	00
	27.	J. P. Bishop	-	-	-	-	2	25
	28.	P. R. Russell	-	-	-	-	10	00
"	C. Leicester's draft on J. A. Collins	-	-	-	-	200	00	
May	2.	C. M. Burleigh	-	-	-	-	9	00
	9.	J. P. Bishop	-	-	-	-	12	54
	15.	N. H. Whiting	-	-	-	-	21	00
"	Richard Hood	-	-	-	-	30	11	
	18.	W. L. Garrison, bill on Baring, Brothers & Co. for £30, 109 per et.	-	-	-	-	145	33
"	J. A. Collins	-	-	-	-	100	00	
	28.	N. H. Whiting	-	-	-	-	68	09
June	1.	J. A. Collins	-	-	-	-	1,011	95
"	J. C. Jackson	-	-	-	-	20	00	
	22.	C. C. Burleigh	-	-	-	-	1	00
	29.	J. D. Herrick	-	-	-	-	7	20
	30.	John Jones	-	-	-	-	4	00
"	J. P. Bishop	-	-	-	-	1	75	
"	J. A. Collins	-	-	-	-	98	50	
July	7.	Sumner Lincoln	-	-	-	-	39	48
August	1.	P. R. Russell	-	-	-	-	15	00
	17.	T. P. Ryder	-	-	-	-	79	31
	29.	J. A. Collins	-	-	-	-	200	00
"	do.	do.	-	-	-	-	509	82
"	do.	do.	-	-	-	-	35	00
Sept.	15.	do.	do.	-	-	-	140	00
	28.	do.	do.	-	-	-	25	08
	30.	do.	do.	-	-	-	26	50

Oct.	Sumner Lincoln	-	-	-	-	25 00
16.	C. M. Burleigh	-	-	-	-	7 00
18.	J. A. Collins	-	-	-	-	34 02
22.	do. do.	-	-	-	-	80 95
27.	do. do.	-	-	-	-	5 00
30.	Geo. Bradburn's draft on J. A. Collins	-	-	-	-	365 65
Nov. 4.	J. A. Collins's note to Faxon	-	-	-	-	81 83
7.	Sumner Lincoln	-	-	-	-	29 00
Dec. 5.	J. P. Bishop	-	-	-	-	4 07
"	Richard Hood	-	-	-	-	20 00
	J. A. Collins's wife by Miss Sanborn	-	-	-	-	2 25
	Expenses to Worcester and Springfield of N. P. Rogers and Wm. M. Chace	-	-	-	-	20 00
	T. P. Ryder's draft	-	-	-	-	21 10
	T. P. Ryder in full	-	-	-	-	199 58
	J. A. Collins's note	-	-	-	-	13 00
						<hr/>
						\$5,942 20
	Whole amount paid J. A. Collins	-	\$3,966 24			
	" " " other agents	-	1,975 96			
						<hr/>
						\$5,942 20

Payments made by J. A. Collins, from funds received from Treasury.

1840.

Feb. 12.	Paid note given J. Knapp	-	-	-	-	\$6 25
Mar. 19.	Note given Grant, Daniel & Co.	-	-	-	-	296 25
"	For post paper	-	-	-	-	2 75
"	C. M. Burleigh, agent	-	-	-	-	12 00
April	Magoun's bill making boxes	-	-	-	-	5 82
May 1.	Note to J. K. Hayes	-	-	-	-	31 97
"	Hiram Fox on an account	-	-	-	-	12 00
9.	Note given W. Sears	-	-	-	-	100 00
"	Note given I. Knapp	-	-	-	-	6 25
"	Crocker & Vinton for paper	-	-	-	-	39 00
27.	C. C. Burleigh, for expenses while in Massachusetts	-	-	-	-	25 00
"	P. R. Russell's order	-	-	-	-	10 00
28.	George Foster on account	-	-	-	-	19 38
June 1.	T. P. Ryder	-	-	-	-	10 00
6.	T. P. Ryder's order	-	-	-	-	62 50
"	N. Whiting in full	-	-	-	-	136 75
7.	Note to Grant, Daniel & Co.	-	-	-	-	200 00
2.	Marlboro' Chapel Co. for Hall	-	-	-	-	23 00
July 3.	Note and order to J. S. Brown	-	-	-	-	159 70
9.	B. B. Muzzey's bill	-	-	-	-	72 99
10.	E. Holden on account	-	-	-	-	20 00
12.	Note to I. Knapp, in hands of J. W. Clarke & Co. having been renewed for 2 months	-	-	-	-	328 41
20.	N. H. Whiting	-	-	-	-	12 40
"	J. P. Bishop	-	-	-	-	18 00
Aug. 8.	One quarter's rent of office	-	-	-	-	85 00
12.	Note given I. Knapp for books, and renewed 3 mos. to J. W. Clarke & Co.	-	-	-	-	330 04
26.	S. W. Benedict's draft	-	-	-	-	222 26
	Note to Metcalf, Torrey & Co.	-	-	-	-	89 54

W. D. Ticknor's bill of Dr. Madden's letter	-	-	13	14
J. C. & E. Mann's bill for paper	-	-	30	00
Depository, over amount received from same	-	-	302	87
				<hr/>
			\$3,920	77

Payments made by Treasurer for Publications, Printing and Binding.

1840.

Feb'y 14.	Dow & Jackson	-	-	-	\$38	38
March 3.	C. Wells, for binding	-	-	-	50	00
Oct. 12.	Grant & Daniel, paper	-	-	-	76	00
17.	Dow & Jackson	-	-	-	100	00
18.	Hiram Faxon, binding	-	-	-	20	00
Dec'ber.	Grant & Daniel for paper	-	-	-	203	00
	Crocker & Vinton	"	-	-	24	00
	Papers sent Congress in 1839, by order of Board	"	"	"	37	67
	" " 1840,	"	"	"	152	00
	Hiram Faxon, binding	-	-	-	25	00
	Dow & Jackson	-	-	-	50	00
	H. Faxon, binding	-	-	-	24	61
						<hr/>
					\$800	66

Payments made by Treasurer for Expenses of Fair.

1840.

Hunt's bill	-	-	-	-	\$4	00
Bill sticking	-	-	-	-	1	50
Metcalf, Torrey & Co.	-	-	-	-	97	71
Liberty Bell	-	-	-	-	10	25
Advertising	-	-	-	-	49	25
Marlboro' Chapel Corporation, for use of hall	-	-	-	-	95	00
M. A. W. Johnson's bill sundry expenses	-	-	-	-	6	52
W. Sears	-	-	-	-	14	00
George Hill	-	-	-	-	22	59
Sundry expenses	-	-	-	-	29	30
						<hr/>
					\$330	12

Receipts of Cash at the Depository, for 1840, as per Cash Book.

1840. Balance cash on hand - - - - - \$38 75

January.	From sales merchandize this month	-	-	-	123	62
February.	" " " "	-	-	-	76	12
March.	" " " "	-	-	-	114	49
April.	" " " "	-	-	-	75	76
May.	" " " "	-	-	-	140	02
June.	" " " "	-	-	-	61	64
July.	" " " "	-	-	-	33	15
August.	" " " "	-	-	-	128	68
September	" " " "	-	-	-		
October	" " " "	-	-	-	138	27
	H. G. Chapman	-	-	-	80	95
	Cradle of Liberty	-	-	-	166	09
	N. A. S. Standard	-	-	-	52	67

Monthly Offering	-	-	-	-	81 50
J. A. Collins	-	-	-	-	542 12
Pennsylvania Freeman	-	-	-	-	2 00
Sundry donations	-	-	-	-	291 17
					<hr/>
					\$2,147 00

Payments made at the Depository, as per Cash Book.

H. Bates for services	-	-	-	-	\$8 80
Agent's expenses to Weymouth	-	-	-	-	3 00
Wm. C. Nell, for services	-	-	-	-	196 45
Treasurer, for donations received	-	-	-	-	264 17
Office expenses and fixtures	-	-	-	-	317 18
Cradle of Liberty	-	-	-	-	105 09
A. A. S. Standard	-	-	-	-	58 83
I. Knapp, on account	-	-	-	-	25 25
Faxon and Lewis on account	-	-	-	-	34 00
For gas lights	-	-	-	-	14 43
T. P. Ryder, on account	-	-	-	-	2 00
For merchandise	-	-	-	-	116 84
J. A. Collins	-	-	-	-	239 25
Win. M. Chace, on account	-	-	-	-	131 53
Note given I. Knapp	-	-	-	-	173 12
" " S. P. Adams	-	-	-	-	53 00
" " Wm. Adams	-	-	-	-	141 92
" " H. L. Deveraux	-	-	-	-	80 95
Office rent in part	-	-	-	-	160 00
Monthly Offering	-	-	-	-	10 00
Sundry small items	-	-	-	-	10 49
					<hr/>
					\$2,146 30

Sales made at Depository since Inventory was taken in October, 1840, up to January 22d, 1841.

Cash on hand	-	-	-	-	70
Sales merchandise	-	-	-	-	249 83
Collected on old book account	-	-	-	-	50 75
					<hr/>
					\$301 28

Payments and Expenses during same time.

J. P. Bishop	-	-	-	-	30 07
Massachusetts A. S. Fair	-	-	-	-	38 58
Allowed per order of Board to H. G. Chapman, books contained in above sales	-	-	-	-	51 34
W. C. Nell, services	-	-	-	-	12 00
C. M. Burleigh on account	-	-	-	-	10 00
Postage bill	-	-	-	-	7 80
Office expenses	-	-	-	-	45 79
T. Price, on account	-	-	-	-	2 00
For merchandise	-	-	-	-	5 00
					<hr/>
					\$202 49
Balance due the Society from Wm. M. Chace, who now has charge of the Depository					<hr/>
					\$98 79

Amount of inventory of Depository, taken at wholesale prices	\$5,371 11
From which deduct 50 per cent. to bring these books to cash value	2,685 55
	<hr/>
Balance due on book accounts	1,087 76
Balance of cash in Treasury	483 28
	<hr/>
Balance sales at Depository since inventory was taken	\$4,256 60
	89 79
	<hr/>
Making a total of	\$1,346 39

Debts owed.

To agents	\$692 51
To Dow & Jackson, for printing, exclusive of the Annual Report	198 58
To sundry persons on book account	134 98
To sundry persons for borrowed loan	2,000 00
	<hr/>
Leaving a balance in favor of the Society of	\$1,320 32

There is an unsettled account with J. A. Collins, the result of which cannot be fully ascertained till his return from England.

APPENDIX.

LETTER FROM THOMAS CLARKSON TO WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

DEAR SIR:

When you was in England on a former occasion, you did me the favor to call upon me at Playford Hall, to take a part against the "Colonization Society." Long before this visit, my friend, Mr. Elliot Cresson, had engaged me in its favor, so that I fear that I did not show you the attention and respect (while you was at my house) due to so faithful an apostle of Liberty. You have lately been in England again, but your numerous engagements prevented you from seeing me, though it was your intention to have done so, and to have conversed with me on the same subject. I understand from your friends in London, who sent me a message to that effect, that you wished to know the particular reasons why I changed my mind with respect to that Society. I have no objection to give you a short account of the reasons, which induced me to enter into it, and finally to abandon it.

My attention was first drawn to this subject by Mr. Elliot Cresson, who said that there was at that moment an almost *universal* desire in the people of the United States to abolish *Slavery and the Slave trade*, and that he and they had a plan for this purpose. The plan was to emancipate all those then in bondage there, and to send them to Africa, the land of their fathers, where they were to buy land and form Colonies on the principle of *civilizing the natives* there, of *teaching them Christianity*, and of *preventing the slave trade* in their immediate neighborhood, as well as of trying to put an end to it in other parts, wherever their influence might reach. This desire or disposition in the American people to accomplish so glorious a work was, he said, almost *universal*. It was not confined to the clergy, or persons of superior intellect or high moral character, but it extended through the various classes of society, *even to the planters themselves*, who were then deeply *convinced of the sin of holding their fellow-creatures as slaves*, so that slaves for transportation might be bought for £7 10s. each, (the sum calculated to pay their passage.) Many masters were so convinced of *the sin of slavery*, that they would emancipate, and were then emancipating their slaves, for nothing, that is, *without any pecuniary consideration*, or on the *condition* only, that they should be sent to Africa, and comfortably provided for there. Upon this *universally prevalent* disposition, the *Colonization Society* was founded, and a district, to be called Liberia, on the western coast of Africa, was fixed upon for the purpose. This was the account given me by my friend, Mr. Cresson, and I own that I was *overcome* with joy, and carried away by it. I thought it was one of the sublimest plans ever devised. Here the two great evils of slavery and the slave trade were to be done away at one and the same time in the Uni-

ted States. But *that circumstance*, which astonished me the most was, that there should have broken out *all at once* and *over the whole land*, such a sunshine of benevolent feeling; that men should suddenly, and all at once, have given up long established customs, and the rooted prejudices of ages; and that the hardened hearts of planters should have been all at once melted and softened, and their consciences so smitten, as to have acknowledged *slavholding* to be *a sin*, for which they were anxious to *make reparation at a great sacrifice*, namely, the free emancipation of their slaves. These feelings, on the part of the American people, were not to be accounted for upon *any ordinary principle*. I thought that nothing but the Spirit of God could have worked such a miracle, and that if it was his will that the blessing of freedom should come to American slaves through the means of the Colonization Society, we were bound most thankfully to accept the boon. My astonishment was so great at this miraculous change of things, that I questioned my friend, Mr. Cresson, *over and over again*, if his account was not exaggerated. He replied, always, that it was strictly true. And these were the reasons why I patronized the Society in the very beginning of its formation.

I began now to think very seriously on what had been, at different times, related to me on this subject; and first, how such an immense work was to be accomplished. Nearly *two millions and a half of slaves* were stated to be then in the United States, and all these were to be transported to Africa. It struck me, that no private funds could be collected by Mr. Cresson, either in England or in America, sufficient for this purpose; that it was in fact, and ought to be, a government work; and I told him *my fears* that he would never accomplish his object. He told me, in reply, that besides subscriptions by individuals, the different States in the Union would each give its quota of money towards it, sufficient to transport all the slaves within its own district or boundaries. He then showed me one or two American newspapers, in which it appeared that one of the States, Virginia, I think, had already promised a very large sum, *some thousands of dollars*, to the work, and he believed that the rest of the States would follow the example. Thus my fears were quieted, as they related to this part of the subject. I do not know whether Virginia has to this day fulfilled her promise.

On going more deeply into this subject, *new ideas* rose up to my mind. I began to think, that if the slaves in the United States amounted to the *immense number* reported, with the population every day increasing, by birth, *no man then living* might see this good work brought to an end; and that *during all this time*, that is, during their transportation, all the horrors of slavery would be going on among those who were left behind. I determined, therefore, to satisfy myself on this point; and therefore, when I saw my friend, Mr. Cresson, next, I inquired what was the then state of Liberia; how many emancipated persons had been already imported into it, and what was the number annually expected to be brought into it. I gathered from him, as far as I can now recollect, that between two and three thousand had already come into it, and that more were on their way thither; but that if I waited a little time longer, he could give me a better answer. I accordingly waited for some months, when I found that the recruits began to come in *much more slowly than before*, and that, judging by the last importations, or the number then imported in a given time, I could not expect that more than 1000, or 1500, or at the most 2000 emancipated slaves could be then *counted upon to be sent annually into Liberia*. This alarmed me, and I began to think that some difficulties had occurred in the way of the emigration; either that the *funds were then not equal to the trans-*

portation of more, or that *more could not be* procured. *Not more than 2000 at most*, could be expected to be brought into the colony in a year; whereas not less than 1000 per day should have been sent to that and other parts of the continent of Africa, to get rid of a population of between two and three millions, in any reasonable time. No person, if Mr. Cresson's plan were followed up in *such a slow and lingering manner*, could hope to see the extinction of slavery in the United States in less than 500 years, if at all. Nor could they take off, by such a slow process, even the rising generation as they were born. Nor, if the American government were to take the plan into their own hands, could they, *in any reasonable time*, accomplish the work, were they even to give to the project *every shilling of their surplus revenue in their treasury*, and *employ their whole navy in the transportation of those people*, taking in the rising generations, and all the difficulties which would occur. Even they, the American government, could not accomplish it in less than fifty years. I considered, therefore, Mr. Cresson's plan, so far as related to the removal of these unhappy people, as *impracticable* within the life-time of any man then living, and I told him so repeatedly; but I could never get a satisfactory answer from him, nor can any satisfactory answer ever be given to show that the scheme is practicable; and this ought to weigh with those, who, if this Society still exists, *have a desire to enter into it*. Let such persons, moreover, consider that this Society has already existed, I believe, for eight or nine years, and that there is *not a slave less in the United States now than when they began their work*. Indeed, notwithstanding *all their efforts, during all this time*, there are *many hundreds of thousands more*, in consequence of the increase of population, than when the plan was first proposed; the slave population, according to the best accounts, amounting *now to nearly three millions*. And I may say farther, that if this Society still exists, it is *criminal*; for to hold out that their scheme would produce *the entire extinction of slavery in America*, (and this was held out, with an inconceivable obstinacy,) what was it, or what is it, but to delude the public as well as themselves, and to teach people to *rely upon this one measure*? whereas, if their scheme had never been proposed, they *would have been looking out for some other remedy or cure*.

But I began to have other fears, as I looked into the subject further, from a very different view of it. I began to question, whether the persons to be sent out were *the proper persons to found a new colony in an uncivilized part of the world*, and whether they would not do *more harm than good*. The natives of Africa, besides being called upon to abolish the slave trade in their own territory, were to be *improved in their morals*, to be *civilized*, to be *christianized*; but *were slaves newly emancipated fit persons to carry on such a work?* And yet, by the scheme, such, and such alone, except the officers, were to be employed in it. The scheme had reference only to those *who were then slaves*, and *who were to be made free on the occasion*; that is, just before the sailing of the vessels, which were to convey them to their new homes. Now it is obvious, that if these people were to be sent to Liberia and other parts of the same continent, they would go there *with all the vices of slavery upon their heads*. Theft, lying, prevarication, and trickery of every kind, are the characteristics of a slave, brought on inevitably by the vicious system under which he had been obliged to live. To this are to be added the brutal and superstitious notions, which such people must have; their wants of education, and of any knowledge of civilized life; but, above all, their want of any moral principle to guide them, and their total ignorance of God and religion. Now, I did not think that people of this description were fit to be sent to Africa, to *form a pattern colony* for the

imitation of the natives there; for they were not persons of a *pattern* to conduct themselves. These were my thoughts upon this part of my subject, and I mentioned them several times to Mr. Cresson. He said that hitherto he had taken all the care he could to make a selection, but admitted that 120 of this description had come into Liberia amongst the last importations. He candidly confessed, that he did not see how he could help himself on a future occasion. Indeed, he spoke only the truth; for the scheme *related only to those who were then in bondage*, and who, as soon as ever they were emancipated, (however unfit they might be,) were to be the component parts of the new colonies in Africa.

You will see in this narrative my reasons for patronizing at first, the American Colonization Society, and my reasons also for having afterwards deserted it. I left it, first, because it was *entirely impracticable*. This is a *sufficient reason* of itself; for no man in his senses would pursue a plan, which he thought could never be accomplished. I left it, secondly, because I thought that *newly emancipated* slaves were not qualified to become colonists in Africa to any good purpose. How could persons be sent with any propriety to *civilize others*, who *wanted civilizing themselves*? Besides, the advocates for the Colonization Society in America had no right to send the ~~sum~~ of their population to Africa to breed a moral pestilence there. As far, however, as the *abolition of the slave trade concurred* in the plan, it must be allowed that Liberia has done a great deal of good. But then, this was *the first colony* planted, and the people sent there, as Mr. Cresson assured me, were more select. Many of these had been emancipated a considerable time before, and had got their own living, knowing something of the habits of civilized life. My argument relates only to *newly emancipated slaves*, who, according to the scheme, were to be hurried off from the plantations as soon as their liberty was given them. If the Society did not take these people, then the prospectus, offered to the public, had no meaning in it, and slavery could never, according to its promises, be *extinguished* in the United States.

Since writing the above, I have learnt from an American paper, that a skirmish has taken place between the colonists of Liberia and the people of Gaytoombah's town. I know nothing of the causes of this apparently little war, but am grieved to learn, when the skirmish was over, that a most wanton, deliberate, cool-blooded act of butchery was practised *by the missionaries themselves*; who *boasted*, that while the people of Gaytoombah's town were gathering up their dead, they had the "*best chance of any to fire into their groups*, and when they had turned their backs, *to pepper their hams with buck-shot*." This was too bad, and contrary to the usages of war among civilized nations; but *to rejoice in, to boast of, to make a joke of* such a murderous deed, belonged only to savages; and yet these men were, we repeat, *missionaries, disciples of the Prince of Peace*, and perhaps *leading men* in the colony. What effect such barbarous conduct will have upon the natives, to prevent future colonies from being settled on their coast, we may perhaps live to see. The news of this massacre will certainly be spread by the Kroo-men all over the African coast, and the Colonization Society may be deprived of the power of making further purchases in Africa, except in their own immediate vicinity, where they may have done some good. If this should ever be the case, they may bid farewell to their future hopes. Where, then, will they provide land on this continent for three millions of emancipated slaves?

But I have not done with the subject yet. Mr. Cresson had scarcely left England the last time, when new information was given me on this same subject by two American gentlemen of the very highest moral

reputation, by which I was led to suppose two things; either that I had mistaken Mr. Cresson in his numerous conversations with me, or that he had allowed me to entertain erroneous impressions without correcting them. It was true, as my two friends informed me, that there had actually been a great stir or agitation in the United States on this subject, and quite as extensive and general as Mr. Cresson had represented it to be, but that the cause of it was not *a religious feeling*, as I had been led to imagine, by which the planters *had been convinced of the sin of slavery*, but a base feeling of fear, which seemed to pervade all of them, and which urged them *to get rid of the free people of color* by sending them to Africa. These people were more knowing, intelligent and cultivated than the slaves, and, it was believed, were likely to join them, and be very useful to them in the case of an insurrection; so that if these were once fairly sent out of the country, they, the planters, might the more safely rule their then slaves with a rod of iron. This information was accompanied by an account, by way of proof, taken from American newspapers, of different meetings held by the friends of the Colonization Society in different States of the Union, and of the speeches made there. It appeared from these speeches, that the most violent supporters of this society *were planters themselves*, and that the speakers did not hesitate to hold out the monstrous and hateful proposition, that the negroes were *not men and women*, but that they belonged to the *brute creation*. It was impossible to read these speeches, which were so many public documents, and not perceive that the persons then assembled were no friends, but bitter enemies, to the whole African race, and that *nothing in the way of good intentions* towards the negro could be expected from them. It is unnecessary for me to attempt to describe what my feelings were upon this occasion. I will only say that I saw the scheme—shall I say the diabolical scheme?—with new eyes, and that the new light thus thrown upon it, added to the two arguments before mentioned, determined me to wash my hands clean for ever of the undertaking.

With respect to my dear and revered friend, Mr. Wilberforce, I will tell you what was his opinion on the subject. He saw Mr. Cresson through my introduction, and having heard patiently all that Mr. Cresson had to say in favor of his scheme, put this important question to him:—“Why, when the government of the United States have millions of acres of land, whole States, indeed, at their disposal, why do you send them to Africa for a new home, when you can locate them in the country in which they were born, and to which they have a claim by birthright, and on account of services to the community?” Mr. Cresson never answered this question so as to satisfy Mr. Wilberforce, and Mr. Wilberforce would not stir a step till it was answered. His opinion was, that if Congress were composed of just and honest men, they would locate these slaves in a territory neighboring to their own, and make a separate State of them, and have them represented on the floor of Congress; or that they would send them to a great distance, making an allied State of them there, and sending proper officers and magistrates with them, to live among them, and to put them in the way of governing themselves. But he gave the preference to the former measure. He always thought that there was something hidden in Mr. Cresson’s plan, which was purposely concealed.

I have now given you my reasons for having once patronized the Colonization Society, and then deserted it, and hope you will consider them satisfactory.

I am, dear Sir, with great esteem,

Very truly and cordially yours,

THOMAS CLARKSON.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN DANIEL O'CONNELL AND
LUCRETIA MOTT.

To DANIEL O'CONNELL, M. P.

The rejected delegates from America to the "General Anti-Slavery Conference," are desirous to have the opinion of one of the most distinguished advocates of universal liberty, as to the reasons urged by the majority for their rejection, viz: that the admission of women, being contrary to English usage, would subject them to ridicule, and that such recognition of their acknowledged principles would prejudice the cause of human freedom.

Permit me, then, on behalf of the delegation, to ask of Daniel O'Connell the favor of his sentiment, as incidentally expressed in the meeting on the morning of the 13th inst., and oblige his sincere friend,

LUCRETIA MOTT.

London, 6th mo. 17, 1840.

16 Pall Mall, 20th June, 1840.

MADAM—Taking the liberty of protesting against being supposed to adopt any of the complimentary phrases in your letter, as being applicable to me, I readily comply with your request to give my opinion as to the propriety of the admission of the female delegates into the Convention.

I should premise by avowing, that my first impression was strong against that admission; and I believe I declared that opinion in private conversation. But when I was called on, by you, to give my personal decision on the subject, I felt it my duty to investigate the grounds of the opinion I formed; and upon that investigation, I easily discovered that it was founded on no better grounds than an apprehension of the ridicule it might excite, if the Convention were to do what is so unusual in England—to admit women to an equal share and right of discussion. I also, without difficulty, recognized that this was an unworthy, and indeed a cowardly motive, and I easily overcame its influence.

My mature consideration of the entire subject convinces me of the right of the female delegates to take their seats in the Convention, and of the injustice of excluding them. I do not care to add, that I deem it also impolitic; because that exclusion being unjust, it ought not to have taken place, even if it could also be politic.

My reasons are—*First*—That as it has been the practice in America for females to act as delegates and office-bearers, as well as in the common capacity of members of anti-slavery societies, the persons who called this Convention ought to have warned the American Anti-Slavery Societies to confine their choice to males—and, for want of this caution, many female delegates have made long journeys by land, and crossed the ocean, to enjoy a right which they had no reason to fear would be withheld from them at the end of their tedious voyage.

Secondly—The cause, which is so intimately interwoven with every good feeling of humanity, and with the highest and most sacred principles of Christianity—the anti-slavery cause in America—is under the greatest, the deepest, the most heart-biding obligations to the females who have joined the anti-slavery societies in the United States. They have shown a passive, but permanent courage, which ought to put many of the male advocates to the blush. The American ladies have persevered in our holy cause, amidst difficulties and dangers, with the zeal of confessors, and the firmness of martyrs—and, therefore, emphatically they should not be dispraised or discouraged by any slight or con-

tumely offered to their rights. Neither are this slight and contumely much diminished by the fact, that it was not intended to offer any slight or to convey any contumely. Both results inevitably follow from the fact of rejection. This **ought not to be**.

Thirdly—Even in England, with all our fastidiousness, women vote upon the great regulation of the Bank of England; in the nomination of its directors and governors, and in all other details, equally with men; that is, they assist in the most awfully important business, the regulation of the currency of this mighty empire, influencing the fortunes of all commercial nations.

Fourthly—Our women, in like manner, vote at the India House—that is, in the regulation of the government of more than one hundred millions of human beings.

Fifthly—Mind has no sex; and in the peaceable struggle to abolish slavery, all over the world, it is the basis of the present Convention, to seek success by peaceable, moral and intellectual means alone, to the utter exclusion of physical force or armed violence. We are engaged in a strife, not of strength, but of argument. Our warfare is not military—it is strictly christian. We wield not the weapons of destruction or injury to our adversaries. We rely entirely on reason and persuasion common to both sexes, and on the emotions of benevolence and charity, which are more lovely and permanent amongst women than amongst men.

In the church to which I belong, the female sex are devoted by as strict rules, and with as much if not more unceasing austerity, to the performance (and that to the exclusion of all worldly or temporal joys and pleasures,) of all works of humanity, of education, of benevolence, and of charity, in all its holy and sacred branches, as the men.

The great work in which we are now engaged, embraces all these charitable categories; and the women have the same duties, and should therefore enjoy the same rights with the men, in the performance of their duties.

I have a consciousness that I have not done *my* duty in not sooner urging these considerations on the Convention. My excuse is, that I was unavoidably absent during the discussion on the subject.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, Madam,
Your obedient servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

Mrs. LUCRETIA MOTT.

LETTER FROM WILLIAM HOWITT TO LUCRETIA MOTT.

LONDON, June 27th, 1840.

DEAR FRIEND:

I snatch the few last minutes of a very hurried time before embarking for Germany, to express to you and your fellow delegates the sense I have of your unworthy reception in this country, which has grown on me for the last week extremely, even amid the overwhelming pressure of arrangements, inevitable on quitting London for a considerable stay abroad. Mary and myself greatly regret that we had left our home before we had the opportunity of seeing you, or we should have had the sincerest pleasure of welcoming you here to spend at least one day of quiet, as pleasant as that which we spent with you at our worthy

friend, Mr. Ashurst's, at Muswell Hill. I regret still more, that my unavoidable absence from town prevented my making part of the Convention, as nothing should have hindered me from stating there, in the plainest terms, my opinion of the real grounds on which you were excluded.

It is pitiable that you were excluded on the plea of being women; but it is disgusting, that under that plea, you were actually excluded as heretics. That is the real ground of your exclusion, and it ought to have been at once proclaimed and exposed by the liberal members of the Convention; but I believe they were not aware of the fact. I heard of the circumstance of your exclusion at a distance, and immediately said—"Excluded on the ground that they are women?" No, that is not the real cause—there is something behind. Who and what are these female delegates? Are they orthodox in religion? The answer was, "No, they are considered to be of the Hicksite party of Friends." My reply was, "That is enough—*there* lies the real cause, and there needs no other. The influential Friends in the Convention would never for a moment tolerate their presence there, if they could prevent it. They hate them, because they have dared to call in question their sectarian dogmas and assumed authority, and they have taken care to brand them in the eyes of the Calvinistic Dissenters, who form another large and influential portion of the Convention, as Unitarians—in their eyes the most odious of heretics."

But what a miserable spectacle is this! The "World's Convention" converting itself into the fag-end of the yearly meeting of the Society of Friends! That Convention, met from various countries and climates to consider how it shall best advance the sacred cause of humanity,—of the freedom of the race, independent of caste or color,—immediately falls the victim of bigotry, and one of its first acts is, to establish a caste of sectarian opinion, and to introduce color into the very soul! Had I not seen, of late years, a good deal of the spirit which now rules the Society of Friends, my surprise would have been unbounded at seeing *them* argue for the exclusion of women from a public body, *as women*. But nothing which they do now surprises me. They have in this case, to gratify their wretched spirit of intolerance, at once abandoned one of the most noble and most philosophical of the established principles of their own Society. That Society claims, and claims justly, to be the first Christian body, which has recognized the great Christian doctrine, that **THERE IS NO SEX IN SOULS**—that male and female are all one in Christ Jesus. They were Fox, and Penn, and the first giants of the Society, who dared, in the face of the whole world's prejudices, to place woman in her first rank,—to recognize and maintain her moral and intellectual equality. It was this Society which thus gave to woman her inalienable rights,—her true liberty; which restored to her the exercise of mind, and the capacity to exhibit before man, her assumed ancient lord and master, the highest qualities of the human heart and understanding—discretion, sound counsel, sure sagacity, mingled with feminine delicacy, and that beautiful, innate modesty, which avails more to restrain its possessor within the bounds of prudence and usefulness, than all the laws and customs of corrupt society. It was this Society which, at once fearless in its confidence in woman's goodness and sense of propriety, gave to its female portion its own Meetings of Discipline—meetings of civil discussion, and transaction of actual and various business. It was this Society which did more—which permitted its women, in the face of a great apostolic injunction, to stand forth in its churches and preach the gospel. It has in fact sent them out, armed with the authority of its certificates, to the very

ends of the earth, to preach in public—to visit and persuade in private. And what has been the consequence? Have the women put their faith and philosophy to shame? Have they disgraced themselves or the Society which has confided in them? Have they proved by their follies, their extravagances, their unwomanly boldness and want of a just sense of decorum, that these great men were wrong? On the contrary, I will venture to say, and I have seen something of all classes, that there is not in the whole civilized world, a body of women to be found, of the same numbers, who exhibit more modesty of manner and delicacy of mind than the ladies of the Society of Friends; and few who equal them in sound sense and dignity of character. There can be no question, that the recognition of the moral and intellectual equality of the most lovely and interesting portion of our Society has tended, and that very materially, to raise them greatly in value, as wives, as bosom friends, and domestic counsellors, whose inestimable worth is only discovered in times of trial and perplexity.

And here have gone the little men of the present day, and have knocked down, in the face of the world, all that their mighty ancestors, 'in this respect, had built up'! If they are at all consistent, they must carry out their new principle, and sweep with it through the ancient constitution of their own society. They must at once put down meetings of discipline amongst their women—they must call home such as are in distant countries, or are traversing this, preaching and visiting families. There must be no more appointments of women to meet committees of men, to deliberate on matters of great importance to the Society. But the fact, my dear friend, is, that bigotry is never consistent, except that it is always narrow, always ungracious, and always, under plea of uniting God's people, scattering them one from another, and rendering them weak as water.

I want to know what religious opinions have to do with a 'World's Convention?' Did you meet to settle doctrines, or conspire against slavery? Many an august council has attempted to settle doctrines, and in vain; and you had before you a subject so vast, so pressing, so monstrous, that, in presence of its sublimity, any petty jealousy and fancied idea of superiority ought to have fallen as dust from the boughs of a cedar. You, as delegates, had to meet this awful fact in the face, and to consider how it should be grappled with!—how the united power of civilized nations should be brought to bear upon it! The fact, that, after nearly a century of gradually growing and accumulating efforts to put down slavery and the slave-trade, little has been done—that there are now more slaves in the world than ever, and that the slave-trade is far more extensive and monstrous than it was when Clarkson raised his voice against it, and dedicated himself body and soul to its extinction—that is a fact, which, if the men who now take the lead in warning on the evil, were truly great men, it would silence in them every other feeling than that of its enormity; and the godlike resolve, that all hands and all hearts should be raised before Heaven, and united in its spirit, to chase this spreading villany from the earth speedily and forever. But men, however benevolent, cannot be great men if they are bigots. Bigots are like the peasants who build their cabins in the mighty palaces of the ancient Cæsars. The Cæsars who raised the vast fabrics are gone, and their power in which they raised them is gone with them. Poor and little men raise their huts within those august palace walls, and fancy themselves the inhabitants of the palaces themselves. So, in the mighty fane of Christianity, bigots and *sectarians* are continually rearing their little cabins of sects and parties, and would fain persuade us, while they fill their own narrow tenements,

that they fill the glorious greatness of Christianity itself! It is surely high time that, after eighteen hundred years of Christ's reign, we should be prepared to allow each other to hold an opinion on the most important of all subjects to ourselves. It is surely time that we opened our eyes sufficiently to see what is so plain in the gospel—the sublime difference between the spirit of Christ, and the spirit of his disciples when they fain would have made a *bigot* of him. ‘We saw men doing miracles in thy name—and we forbade them.’ ‘Forbid them not, for they who are not against us are with us.’ It is not by *doctrines* that Christ said that his disciples should be known, but by their *fruits*—and by the greatest of all fruits—*love*. You, dear friend, and those noble women to whom I address myself when addressing you, have shown in your own country the grand christian testimonial of love to mankind in the highest degree. You have put your lives in your hands, for the sake of man's freedom from caste, color and mammon;—and the greatest disgrace that has of late years befallen this country is, that you have been refused admittance as delegates to the Convention, met ostensibly to work that very work for which you have so generously labored and freely suffered.

The Convention has not merely insulted you, but those who sent you. It has testified that the men of America are at least far ahead of us in their opinion of the discretion and usefulness of women. But, above all, this act of exclusion has shown how far the Society of Friends is fallen from its ancient state of greatness, and catholic nobleness of spirit.

But my time is gone. I have not said one half, one tenth, one hundredth part of what I could say to you and to your companions on this subject; but of this be assured, time and your own delegators will do you justice. The true Christians in all ages were the heretics of the time; and this I say, not because I believe exactly as you do—for, in truth, I neither know nor desire to know, exactly, how far we think alike. All that I know or want to know is, that you have shown the grand mark of Christian truth—*love* to mankind.

I have heard the noble Garrison blamed that he has not taken his place in the Convention, because you, his fellow delegates, were excluded. I, on the contrary, honor him for his conduct. In mere worldly wisdom, he might have entered the Convention, and there entered his protest against the decision—but in at once refusing to enter, where you, his fellow delegates, were shut out, he has entered a far nobler protest, not in the mere convention, but in the world at large. I honor the lofty principle of that true champion of humanity, and shall always recollect with delight the day Mary and I spent with you and him.

I must apologise for this most hasty, and, I fear, illegible scrawl, and with our kind regards and best wishes for your safe return to your native country, and for many years of honorable labor there for the truth and freedom, I beg to subscribe myself, most sincerely, your friend,

WILLIAM HOWITT.

PROTEST.

LONDON, June 23, 1840.

We, the undersigned, delegates to the General Anti-Slavery Convention, which was proposed to be held in London, on the 12th of June, 1840, anxious to promote the usefulness of this and of future Conventions, deem it a part of our duty to place upon record this our solemn PROTEST against certain principles recognized, and proceedings held in the aforesaid Convention. This Convention, in our judgment, affords precedents both to be followed, and to be avoided; and the useful purposes which it may subserve, would be in an important measure abridged, if the latter were not prominently exhibited. The errors that have been committed may have arisen from the novelty of the circumstances, and consequent inexperience, or from a want of attention to first principles, until steps were taken which could not readily be recalled; from any cause, we are willing to suppose, than from a deficiency of zeal and devotedness to the great object of the emancipation of the human race from slavery; but, to whatever cause they may be attributable, either in the judgment of Christian charity, or as a matter of fact, the obligation is not less imperative to guard, as far as possible, against their future recognition and adoption.

I. We protest, first, against the limited character given to the Convention. When we were delegated to attend this Convention, we had supposed that it would be a Convention of delegates from various parts of the world, which should exist and act distinct, separate and independent of all contemporary anti-slavery associations, except in so far as those associations were represented in the persons of their delegates. Instead of this, we have received the intimation, practically confirmed by numerous circumstances, that this Convention is of the nature of a Conference with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society of London—a Society whose objects, as far as we understand them, we entirely approve, just as we approve of the objects of every Anti-Slavery Society elsewhere, but which we supposed, like them, would have been represented by its delegates, and would have sustained no other relation to the Convention than such a delegation implies. We deny that the Convention should be deemed an offshoot or emanation from any one anti-slavery society whatever, and that so to describe, constitute and conduct it, is to lower its character and contract its usefulness, and thus to commit an act of injustice to the friends of the slave, and to the sacred cause of humanity.

II. We protest against the recognition of the roll of delegates handed in by the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. To accept such a roll, authenticated only by that Committee, which was self-constituted for such a purpose, and derived no authority from the Convention to undertake such a duty, is to subject the Convention to the will of a few, and to give those few the absolute power of framing the Convention according to their own pleasure.

III. We protest against the power assumed by the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, to exclude from membership in the Convention persons duly delegated by anti-slavery societies in America—a power which that Committee assumed even before the Convention was constituted; thus in one act trampling on the rights of individuals, and dictating to the Convention about to assemble: while, on the other hand, that Committee assumed the power to make all its own members, and all the corresponding members of the British and

Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, *ex officio*, members of the Convention—a power not granted by the Convention, and not assumed by any other Anti-Slavery Committee or Society.

IV. We protest against the power assumed by the Convention, to exclude the same persons from membership, since it rested exclusively with the societies by which they were delegated to determine by whom those societies should be represented.

V. We protest against the deference shown to mere custom and usage in a Convention of Delegates from all parts of the World, it having been declared to be chiefly from such considerations that membership was denied to the aforesaid delegates—a ground of expediency inconsistent with the principle of the whole anti-slavery movement, and with the original character of the Convention.

VI. Finally, we protest against the irregular and partial manner in which the rules of debate have been administered—there having been no real freedom of discussion, and the right to speak having been often determined, not by any general principle applicable to all alike, but by the favor or disfavor with which the speaker or the subject was regarded by the party wielding the power of the meeting.

While necessity imposes on us the painful duty we have now discharged, we feel equally bound to express our most sincere and cordial concurrence in the general objects and measures which have received the sanction of the Convention.

W. ADAM,

JAMES MOTT,

CHAS. E. LESTER,

ISAAC WINSLOW,

WENDELL PHILLIPS,

JONA. P. MILLER,

GEO. BRADBURN.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

RESOLVES

Relating to Slavery and the Slave Trade, and the admission of new States into the Union.

Whereas, domestic slavery exists in the District of Columbia, under the express authority of Congress, which, at the time of the cession of the District, re-enacted the slave codes of Maryland and Virginia; and whereas, the sanction thus given to slavery, and its continued toleration at the seat of government, form a manifest violation by this nation of the first principles of justice, and have a tendency to corrupt the moral sense, and to lower the character of the whole people of the United States; and whereas, this nation can have no higher interest, either before God or in the eyes of men, than the establishing of justice, and strengthening the just foundations of national honor; and whereas, slavery in the District of Columbia being thus a national concern, and involving national responsibility, it is the right of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to remonstrate against the common wrong and the degradation of national character; therefore

Resolved, That Congress ought to exercise its acknowledged power, in the immediate suppression of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia.

And whereas, by the Constitution of the United States, Congress has the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and between the several States of the Union, in the exercise of which power, Congress in the year 1808 abolished the foreign slave trade: and whereas, a do-

mestic slave trade, as unjustifiable in principle as the African slave trade, and scarcely less cruel and inhuman in practice, is now carried on between the several States: therefore

Resolved, That the domestic slave trade ought to be abolished by Congress, without delay.

Resolved, That no new State ought to be admitted into the Union, whose constitution shall tolerate domestic slavery.

Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to use their utmost efforts to give effect to the foregoing resolves.

Resolved, That His Excellency, the Governor, be requested to forward a copy of these resolves to each of the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts in Congress.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

IN THE HOUSE, March 6, 1840.

The joint Special Committee on Slavery, to whom were referred an order of Feb. 6, 1840, instructing them to consider what action, if any, it is expedient for this Legislature to take in relation to the resolution adopted by the House of Representatives in Congress, as one of its standing rules, on the 28th of January, 1840, and also the petition of E. W. Gardner and sixty others, of Nantucket, praying the legislature to protest against the said resolution as a violation of the Constitution of these United States, together with various other petitions of the same import, have taken the subject into consideration, and ask leave to Report the following Resolves.

GEORGE BRADBURN,
Per order of the Committee.

RESOLVES

Concerning the denial by the United States House of Representatives of the Right of Petition.

Resolved, That the resolution which was adopted by the House of Representatives of the United States, on the 28th of January, 1840, namely, "That no petition, memorial, resolution, or other paper, praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any State or Territory, or the slave trade between the States or Territories of the United States in which it now exists, shall be received by the House, or entertained in any manner whatever,"—is regarded by this Legislature as a palpable violation of the Constitution of the United States, a bold denial of inalienable rights, and a stretch of power, which can never be quietly submitted to by a free people.

Resolved, That in the name of the people of this Commonwealth, this Legislature enters its solemn Protest against the said standing rule, as being void in its inception, and of no binding force upon the people or their representatives.

Resolved, That the manner in which the petitions of the people on this subject have been treated in the Senate of the United States,—namely, in laying the question of their reception upon the table,—is a virtual denial of the right of petition, and a procedure not less despotic, in effect, than the unconstitutional rule adopted by the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That His Excellency the Governor be requested to forward a copy of these resolves to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, with a request that they be laid before both branches of that body.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR.

To the Senate and House of Representatives :

Among the Bills and Resolves which have been received at the Secretary's Office, there are certain Resolutions of the two Houses, entitled, "Resolves concerning the denial by the United States House of Representatives of the right of petition;" "Resolves concerning the duty on salt, and the bounty to fishing vessels;" Resolves concerning a national bankrupt law," and "Resolves relating to slavery, and the slave trade, and the admission of new States into the Union."

The mode of transmitting the acts of the two houses, does not indicate those upon which it is desired or expected that the Governor should exercise his revising power. This is left to be inferred from the nature of the acts themselves. Many declaratory resolves have heretofore been passed, without receiving the revision of the Chief Magistrate.

Although the Constitution provides that "no bill or resolve" "shall become a law, and have force as such," until it shall have been laid before the Governor for his revisal, and although this revision seems to partake of the nature of legislation, yet I believe the Governor is never deemed a part of the Legislature. The manner of choosing electors of President and Vice President has been directed by the concurrent act of the two Houses, without the approval of the Governor; and the United States Senators are always so chosen. Both these are required to be done by the LEGISLATURE. The power to revise, implies the power to negative; and an Executive veto of an expression of the opinions or of the instructions of the Legislature, would seem to be unjustifiable and unauthorized.

These resolutions do not prescribe any rules of action to be enforced, nor do they assume to have the force of laws. And whether they are declarations of the will or opinion of the Legislature, or advice, or instructions to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, they do not, in my opinion, fall within my province of revision. And should I attempt to add to their force or validity, by giving to them my official sanction, I think it would be an assumption of power not delegated to me.

Although precluded from giving an official opinion upon these Resolves, I will avail myself of the occasion to declare my deep conviction of the unrighteousness of slavery, and my readiness to co-operate in any measures which are just and right in themselves, consistent with the national and State Constitutions, and calculated to relieve any portion of the human family who are held in bondage. No member of either house holds the right of petition more sacred than I do, or is more ready to maintain it. The measures of Congress referred to in the first named resolutions, tend to inflame rather than allay excitement, and are in my opinion inexpedient and unjust; and were I in a situation to act upon them, I should deem it my duty to oppose them in the most effectual manner in my power.

Being uncertain whether the two Houses desired, or expected that these Resolves should receive the revision of the Governor, I have thought that a proper respect for them required that I should communicate to them the reasons why these Resolves will not be found in the list of Acts and Resolves which have become laws, and inform them that I have, in compliance with their request, directed the Secretary to transmit copies of them to each of the Senators and Representatives of the State in the Congress of the United States.

MARCUS MORTON.

COUNCIL CHAMBER, March 21, 1840.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, March 24, 1840.
 The Special Committee to whom was referred the Message this day received from His Excellency the Governor, respecting certain resolutions of the two branches of the Legislature, have considered the same, and respectfully

REPORT:

That the general practice has been for the Governor to express his approval of resolutions passed by the Legislature, indicating its opinions upon important questions.

An examination, such as the Committee have been able to make, with the assistance of the Secretary of the Commonwealth, has disclosed the fact, that such resolutions have been uniformly approved by the Governor for the last fifteen years, and, with three exceptions, for twice that period. Your Committee believe, that the Constitution does not require the Governor to approve such doings of the Legislature, or to return them with his objections, it being silent on the subject. But, we believe, the Governor has the same right to signify officially his approval of resolutions passed by the Legislature, which the latter has to adopt them. The right has never been doubted, hitherto, but has been exercised, so far as we can learn, by all the predecessors of His Excellency, without complaint by the Legislature or by the people. The approval of the "Supreme Executive Magistrate" gives to the expression of sentiment by the Legislature additional weight, by the sanction of his high official station. It is therefore happy for the Commonwealth, when the concurrent views of the Legislature and of the Executive, on subjects of vital importance, are unitedly and harmoniously expressed. Yet whenever the Governor dissents from the Legislature, in matters of opinion merely, not terminating in action he has an undoubted right to withhold his approval.

The Committee recommend that no action of the House be had on the message. By order of the committee.

CHARLES ALLEN, *Chairman.*

RESOLUTIONS

Relative to Slavery and the Slave Trade, &c.

[Adopted by the House of Representatives at the late session of the Legislature of Vermont.]

Whereas domestic slavery exists in the District of Columbia, under the express authority of Congress, which, at the time of the cession of the District, re-enacted the slave codes of Maryland and Virginia; and whereas the sanction thus given to slavery, and its continued toleration at the seat of government, form a manifest violation, by this nation, of the first principles of justice, and have a tendency to corrupt the moral sense and lower the character of the whole people of the United States; and whereas this nation can have no higher interest, either before God or in the eyes of men, than the establishment of justice and strengthening the just foundations of national honor; and whereas slavery in the District of Columbia, being thus a national concern, and involving national responsibility, it is the right of the State of Vermont to remonstrate against the common wrong, and the degradation of national character; therefore

Resolved, That Congress ought to exercise its acknowledged power in the immediate suppression of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia.

And whereas, by the Constitution of the United States, Congress has power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and between the several States of the Union, in the exercise of which power, Congress in the year eighteen hundred and eight abolished the foreign slave trade; and whereas a domestic slave trade, as unjustifiable in principle as the African slave trade, and scarcely less cruel and inhuman in practice, is now carried on between the several States; therefore

Resolved, That the domestic slave trade between the several States ought to be abolished by Congress without delay.

Resolved, That no new State ought to be admitted into the Union, whose constitution shall tolerate domestic slavery.

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to use their utmost efforts to give effect to the foregoing resolves.

Resolved, That his Excellency the Governor be requested to forward a copy of these resolves to each of the Senators and Representatives from Vermont in Congress.

In House of Representatives, Oct. 29, 1840. Passed.

P. T. WASHBURN, Assistant Clerk.

PROTEST.

The Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society have voted to transfer the Emancipator to the New York City Society, on the alleged ground that they can no longer provide the means necessary to sustain it.

In the name of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, I protest against this act of the Committee, for the following (among other) reasons:

1. The Emancipator is not the property of the Executive Committee. It belongs to the American Society, which is constituted of the abolitionists of the country, who have sustained it through a long period of pecuniary embarrassment, and but for whose aid, it would have ceased to exist long ago. The aggregate excess of expenditure over all its receipts, since 1835, is more than *Ten Thousand Dollars*, which has been liquidated by the American Anti-Slavery Society, and not by its Executive Committee. The Committee, not being its real proprietors, have, therefore, *no right* to dispose of the Emancipator, by sale, transfer, or otherwise.

2. The Emancipator is the official organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society. The Executive Committee were appointed (in part) to conduct that organ, as the official exponent and vindicator of its principles,—as the guardian of its integrity,—as the proper and accredited medium of correspondence with its constituents and auxiliaries. To remove that organ, is, literally, to destroy a part of its organization,—*to strike at the existence* of the American Anti-Slavery Society, whose members never contemplated vesting a suicidal power in their Executive Committee, which they might wield at pleasure.

3. The transfer is not necessary, on the alleged ground. A statement of the property of the Society shows a large balance over all its liabilities.

4. Due respect to the feelings and opinions of the abolitionists generally, dictates the propriety of referring the final disposition of the Emancipator to the approaching annual meeting. A suspension of the publication would be preferable to its transfer, as it would not thereby be placed beyond the power of the Society to resume it; whereas, by the vote now passed, it is irrecoverable.

These are some of the more important considerations which induce my dissent from the vote of the Committee. JAMES S. GIBBONS.

CONSTITUTION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS A. S. SOCIETY.

PREAMBLE.

Whereas, we believe that Slavery is contrary to the precepts of Christianity, dangerous to the liberties of the country, and ought immediately to be abolished; and whereas, we believe that the citizens of New England not only have the right to protest against it, but are under the highest obligation to seek its removal by a moral influence; and whereas we believe that the free people of color are unrighteously oppressed, and stand in need of our sympathy and benevolent co-operation; therefore, recognizing the inspired declaration that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth," and in obedience to our Saviour's golden rule, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them;" we agree to form ourselves into a Society, and to be governed by the following

CONSTITUTION :

ARTICLE 1. This Society shall be called the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and shall be auxiliary to the American Anti-Slavery Society.

ART. 2. The object of the Society shall be to endeavor, by all means sanctioned by law, humanity and religion, to effect the abolition of slavery in the United States; to improve the character and condition of the free people of color, to inform and correct public opinion in relation to their situation and rights, and to obtain for them equal civil and political rights and privileges with the whites.

ART. 3. Any person, by signing the Constitution, and paying to the Treasurer fifteen dollars as a life subscription, or one dollar annually, shall be considered a member of the Society, and entitled to a copy of all its official publications.

ART. 4. The officers of the Society shall be a President, Vice Presidents, a Corresponding Secretary, a Recording Secretary, a Treasurer, an Auditor, and ten Counsellors, who shall be elected annually, by ballot, on the fourth Wednesday of January, or subsequently by adjournment, and shall hold their respective offices until others are chosen.

ART. 5. The foregoing officers shall constitute a Board of Managers, to whom shall be entrusted the disposition of the funds, and the management of the concerns of the Society. They shall have power to make their own by-laws, to fill any vacancy which may occur in their Board, and to employ agents to promote the objects of the Society.

ART. 6. There shall be a public meeting of the Society annually, on the fourth Wednesday of January, at which the Board of Managers shall make a Report of their doings for the past year, and of the income, expenditures, and funds of the Society.

ART. 7. The President shall preside at all meetings of the Society, and of the Board of Managers, or in his absence one of the Vice Presidents, or in their absence a President pro tem.

ART. 8. The Corresponding Secretary shall receive and keep all communications or publications directed to the Society, and transmit those issued by them, and shall correspond with the agents or any other bodies or individuals, according to the directions of the Society or the Managers.

ART. 9. The Recording Secretary shall notify all meetings of the Society and of the Board of Managers, and keep the records of the same.

ART. 10. The Treasurer shall collect the subscriptions and donations to the Society, hold all its funds, and make payments according to the directions of the Managers; he shall keep a true account of the same, and render a statement to accompany the Annual Report of the Society.

ART. 11. Any Anti-Slavery Society, or any association founded on kindred principles, may become auxiliary to this Society, by contributing to its funds, and may communicate with us by letter or delegation.

ART. 12. The Society shall hold meetings on the last Monday of March, June, and September, for the transaction of any business which may be presented by the Board of Managers, or for addresses, or for discussion of any subject connected with the objects of the Society. Special meetings may be called by the Board of Managers, or by the Recording Secretary, on application from ten members of the Society.

ART. 13. This Constitution may be altered at the Annual Meeting for the choice of officers, provided the amendments proposed to be made have been submitted to the Board of Managers, in writing, previously.

